

School of Theology at Claremont



1001 1323989



The Library
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT

WEST FOOTHILL AT COLLEGE AVENUE
CLAREMONT, CALIFORNIA

Sheet 2- ~~Lower Half~~
Upper Half

2615
C38

JOHN THE PRESBYTER

AND THE FOURTH GOSPEL

BY

DOM JOHN CHAPMAN, O.S.B.

OXFORD
AT THE CLARENDON PRESS

1911

Theology Library
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT
California

HENRY FROWDE, M.A.
PUBLISHER TO THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD
LONDON, EDINBURGH, NEW YORK
TORONTO AND MELBOURNE

PREFACE

IT is well to explain that the following arguments were written down in 1903 or 1904, as the situation has somewhat changed since then. Dr. Sanday referred to my MS., which he had been so kind as to read, in his book, *The Criticism of the Fourth Gospel* (1905), p. 252. Since then I have rewritten some passages towards the end, for the sake of clearness, and I have added references to subsequent writers. But the whole matter seems to me just as clear as it did when I first wrote it.

JOHN CHAPMAN, O.S.B.

ERDINGTON ABBEY,
BIRMINGHAM.
July, 1910.

CUM PERMISSU SUPERIORUM ORDINIS.

NIHIL OBSTAT.


J. McINTYRE, CENSOR DEPUTATUS.

IMPRIMATUR.

✠ EDUARDUS EPŪS BIRMINGHAMIENSIS.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
§ 1. The difficulties in the fragment of the Prologue of Papias	7
§ 2. The two interpretations of τοὺς τῶν πρεσβυτέρων λόγους, τί Ἀνδρέας εἶπεν, etc.	9
§ 3. St. Irenaeus understands the Presbyters to be not Apostles, but disciples of the Apostles	13
§ 4. Eusebius understands the Presbyters to be not Apostles, but disciples of the Apostles	17
§ 5. Aristion and John were disciples of the Lord	20
§ 6. Papias knew John the Presbyter and Aristion personally	28
§ 7. Eusebius on John the Presbyter	33
§ 8. St. Irenaeus on John the Presbyter	41
§ 9. Early witnesses to the identity of the Presbyter and the Apostle	49
§ 10. Apostle, Disciple, Presbyter	59
§ 11. Philip the Apostle at Hierapolis	64
§ 12. Consequences of assuming the separate existence of John the Presbyter	72
§ 13. The witness of John the Presbyter to his own identity .	84
Additional note on De Boor's fragment of Philip of Side .	95
INDEX	103



§ I

The difficulties in the fragment of the Prologue of Papias.

IT is a sign of the times that Professor Mommsen, shortly before his death, should have written, with regard to the great question of the origin of the fourth Gospel: 'Der Sitz der Johannes-Controverse ist Eusebius' Bericht über den Papias, *Hist. Eccl.* iii. 39.'¹ There was a time when scholars in Germany thought only of internal evidence; now every scrap of external evidence is weighed and employed, and the results are more hopeful and less bewilderingly diverse. It is possible now for Conservative and Liberal, Catholic and Rationalist, to assist one another, and to work together for the discovery of truth; and though each of us is prejudiced in his own fashion, the honest attempt to judge in a dry light is commoner than it once was,² and we learn much from those who approach the same evidence from a slightly different point of view.

The words of Papias referred to by Mommsen are certainly of immense importance. They have been interpreted in various ways, and have been subjected to many conjectural emendations. One at least of the innumerable commentaries upon them, that of Dr. Zahn,

¹ *Zeitschrift für N.-T. Wiss.* 1902, 2, p. 156.

² I am not sure that this is so true in 1910 as I thought it in 1903-4.

is of wonderful elaboration. Many are of great ingenuity. But it cannot be said that the question is yet settled. I do not despair, however, of reaching a definite and convincing conclusion with regard to the real meaning of Papias. In the following pages I shall examine the available evidence with all possible care, and I shall be obliged to disagree with theologians on both sides of the Johannine question, and to agree in part with those whose final results I reject.

I subjoin the words of Papias cited by Eusebius :

Οὐκ ὀκνήσω δέ σοι, καὶ ὅσα ποτὲ παρὰ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων καλῶς ἔμαθον καὶ καλῶς ἐμνημόνευσα, συγκατατάξαι ταῖς ἐρμηνείαις, διαβεβαιούμενος ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν ἀλήθειαν. Οὐ γὰρ τοῖς τὰ πολλὰ λέγουσιν ἔχαιρον ὥσπερ οἱ πολλοί, ἀλλὰ τοῖς τἀληθῇ διδάσκουσιν, οὐδὲ τοῖς τὰς ἀλλοτρίας ἐντολὰς μνημονεύουσιν, ἀλλὰ τοῖς τὰς παρὰ τοῦ Κυρίου τῇ πίστει δεδομένας καὶ ἀπ' αὐτῆς παραγινομένας τῆς ἀληθείας. Εἰ δέ που καὶ παρηκολουθηκώς τις τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις ἔλθοι, τοὺς τῶν πρεσβυτέρων ἀνέκρινον λόγους, τί Ἀνδρέας ἢ τί Πέτρος εἶπεν, ἢ τί Φίλιππος, ἢ τί Θωμᾶς ἢ Ἰάκωβος, ἢ τί Ἰωάννης ἢ Ματθαῖος ἢ τις ἕτερος τῶν τοῦ Κυρίου μαθητῶν, ἃ τε Ἀριστίων καὶ ὁ πρεσβύτερος Ἰωάννης, τοῦ Κυρίου μαθηταί, λέγουσιν. Οὐ γὰρ τὰ ἐκ τῶν βιβλίων τοσοῦτόν με ὠφελεῖν ὑπελάμβανον, ὅσον τὰ παρὰ ζώσης φωνῆς καὶ μενούσης.—Eus. *H. E.* iii. 39.

The two interpretations of τοὺς τῶν πρεσβυτέρων λόγους, τί Ἀνδρέας εἶπεν, etc.

Who were the Presbyters? Undoubtedly the simplest way to translate τοὺς τῶν πρεσβυτέρων ἀνέκρινον λόγους, τί Ἀνδρέας ἢ τί Πέτρος εἶπεν is this: 'I inquired the words of the Presbyters, that is to say, what Andrew or Peter said,' &c., thus identifying the Apostles enumerated with the Presbyters whose words are asked for. At first sight this even appears to be the only possible meaning, and Dr. Abbott, who does not accept this interpretation, admits that the form of words is 'almost irresistible evidence' in its favour.¹ It has recently been urged with great force by M. Michiels, by Dr. Zahn, and by Dr. Bardenhewer.² It results in making the

¹ *Expositor*, 1895, pp. 336-7.

² Michiels, *L'Origine de l'Épiscopat*, Louvain, 1900, pp. 301-5; Zahn, *Forschungen*, vi, pp. 122, 134 foll.; Bardenhewer, *Gesch. der altkirchl. Litt.*, pp. 538-9; and now by Lepin, *L'Origine du 4^e Évangile* (1907), p. 136, an author with whom I am sorry to disagree, on account of the great admiration I have for his book. Funk speaks with equal decision in his note on the passage, *Patres Apostol.* (1901), i. 352; and Batiffol has followed Funk (*L'Église naissante*, 3rd ed., 1909, p. 205, note). Similarly Gutjahr, *Die Glaubwürdigkeit des Irenäischen Zeugnisses* (Graz, 1904, pp. 77 foll.). But the greatest authority is Lightfoot, *Essays on Supernatural Religion* (1889), p. 145: 'What classes of persons he intends to include under the designation of "elders" he makes clear by the names which follow. The category would include not only Apostles like Andrew and Peter, but also other personal disciples of Christ, such as Aristion and the second John. In other words, the term with

epithet 'Presbyter' identify the second John with the former, instead of distinguishing the two. It has a still more remarkable reaction upon Papias's first sentence, in which he declares himself the direct disciple of the Presbyters, for he appears in consequence as the disciple of a good many Apostles. This is the more interesting, as nowhere else is he called the disciple of more than one, namely St. John.¹

But instead of co-ordinating *τί Ἀνδρέας εἶπεν* with *λόγους*, it is possible to subordinate it to *λόγους*, thus making 'what Andrew and Peter said' the subject of the Presbyters' discourses: 'I used to inquire the words of the Presbyters, what (they said) Peter and Andrew said,' &c., so that *τί Ἀνδρέας εἶπεν* is expegetical of *λόγους*. In this case the Presbyters are the disciples and companions of the Apostles, they are not the Apostles themselves.

This second interpretation is grammatically possible; in fact, between the two interpretations there is rather a difference of sense than of grammar. In both cases 'the words of the Presbyters' were 'what Peter and Andrew and the rest said', whether the Presbyters were themselves Peter and Andrew and the rest saying the things for the first time, or whether they were disciples, repeating them from memory. The whole question him is a synonyme for the Fathers of the Church in the first generation.' Again, p. 146, note: 'Weiffenbach supposes that the elders are distinguished from the Apostles and personal disciples whose sayings Papias sets himself to collect. This view demands such a violent wresting of the grammatical connexion in the passage of Papias that it is not likely to find much favour'. It has, nevertheless, found a good deal of favour since Lightfoot wrote in 1875.

¹ Irenaeus, *Haer.* v. 33. 4.

what Papias meant, and what his readers would understand, depends upon their previous knowledge of who the Presbyters were. To determine by this passage who they were is a *ὑστερον πρότερον*. Examples will make this clear. For the possibly ambiguous word 'Presbyter' let us substitute first 'disciple', which will naturally be understood as equivalent to apostle, and then 'bishop', which will naturally appear to exclude the Apostles.

1. Τοὺς τῶν μαθητῶν ἀνέκρινον λόγους, τί Ἀνδρέας ἢ τί Πέτρος εἶπεν, κτλ.

2. Τοὺς τῶν ἐπισκόπων ἀνέκρινον λόγους, τί Ἀνδρέας ἢ τί Πέτρος εἶπεν, κτλ.

In the first case we instantly identify Peter and Andrew with the disciples. In the second place we instantly and without difficulty identify 'what Peter and Andrew said' with the *λόγοι* of the bishops. Once we have caught the sense of this second interpretation, the reason for the clause *τί Ἀνδρέας*, &c., becomes evident. On the assumption that the Presbyters are not the Apostles, Papias did not want to be told of the Presbyters' remarks about the weather, nor even of their sermons on subjects of the day, but only such words as reported the sayings of the Apostles: 'I asked the words of the Presbyters, what (since, being elders, they recollect) Andrew, Peter, Philip, Thomas, James, John, Matthew, and the rest, told them.'

In order to discover whether the first or the second interpretation is correct, we must first find out whether 'Presbyter' must or can mean 'Apostle'.

Now it is evident that those who had the work of Papias before them must have plainly seen whether he

used *πρεσβύτεροι* elsewhere to mean Apostles or not.¹ We must therefore simply inquire how St. Irenaeus understood him, how Eusebius understood him, and we may add an examination of other uses of the word. The result of our investigation ought to settle the meaning of the passage beyond all controversy.

¹ Rufinus and the Syriac are of no use to us here, since their renderings are just as ambiguous as the Greek. Dr. Zahn (p. 122) had no right to quote them on his side.

§ 3

St. Irenaeus understands the Presbyters to be not Apostles, but disciples of the Apostles.

St. Irenaeus uses *πρεσβύτερος* as synonymous with *ἐπίσκοπος* in many passages. For instance, he speaks to St. Victor of his predecessors Anicetus, Pius, Hyginus, Telesphorus, and Xystus as *πρεσβύτεροι οἱ προστάντες τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἧς σὺ νῦν ἀφηγῇ*,—*οἱ πρὸ σοῦ πρεσβύτεροι* (*Ep. ad Vict.*, Eus. *H. E.* v. 24). He calls the episcopal succession ‘*successiones Presbyterorum in ecclesiis*’ (iii. 23), and the episcopate is ‘*Presbyterii ordo*’ (iv. 26. 3).¹

But it is not such passages which concern us here. It is clear that Papias means *οἱ πρεσβύτεροι* in the etymological sense, not in the ecclesiastical, and the same use is common in St. Irenaeus.

1. The author of the verses against Marcus is never called *πρεσβύτερος* by St. Irenaeus; he is *ὁ κρείσσων ἡμῶν* (i. praef., i. 13. 3), *superior nobis* (iii. 17. 4), *ὁ θεῖος πρεσβύτης*, *divinae aspirationis senior*, and *ὁ θεοφιλής*

¹ Yet presbyter in his time was applied to the lower order; for a curious passage on Acts xx shows that St. Irenaeus did not identify the ‘presbyters’ of v. 17 with the ‘bishops’ of v. 28, for he paraphrases v. 17 thus, with the insertion of the ‘bishops’ to correspond with v. 28: ‘In Mileto enim convocatis episcopis et presbyteris’ (iii. 14. 2). Similarly the letter of the Churches of Lyons and Vienne calls St. Irenaeus a presbyter, when he was not yet bishop (Eus. *H. E.* v. 4).

πρεσβύτης (i. 15. 6), *ex veteribus quidam* (iii. 23. 3), *qui dixit* (iv. 4. 2), *quidam ante nos* (iv. 41. 2), and possibly *τις τῶν προβεβηκότων* (v. 17. 4), unless Papias is here meant.¹

2. The author of the sermon heard by St. Irenaeus, possibly Pothinus,² is repeatedly called presbyter: 'Quemadmodum audiui a quodam presbytero, qui audierat ab his qui apostolos viderant et ab his qui didicerant' (understand 'qui didicerant ab eis', iv. 27. 1), 'sicut dixit presbyter' (ibid.), 'inquit ille senior' (πρεσβύτης or πρεσβύτερος? ibid. 2), 'sicut et presbyter dicebat' (iv. 30. 1), 'talía quaedam enarrans de antiquis presbyter reficiebat nos' (iv. 30. 4). Notice that he is not even a disciple of the Apostles, but of disciples of the Apostles.³

3. Polycarp, 'who was not only made a disciple by Apostles, and a comrade of many who had seen Christ, but also was made bishop in Asia in the Church of Smyrna by Apostles' (iii. 3. 4), is numbered among the

¹ It is not certain that all these passages refer to the writer of the poem against Marcus. But Harnack (*Chronol.*, p. 333, note 2) has overlooked Lightfoot's proofs (given in the *Academy*, Sept. 21, 1889, p. 116, and *Clement of Rome*, 1890, vol. ii, pp. 405-6), that there are verses certainly in i. praef. and iii. 17. 4. I think all the other places were verses, in all probability. But Harnack and Zahn (*Forschungen*, vi, pp. 61-3) may be right in suggesting Justin in one or the other place.

² So Harnack, Zahn, and Sanday (*Criticism of the Fourth Gospel*, p. 61).

³ Therefore the preacher of the sermon is not the same as the presbyter of iv. 32. 1, 'De duobus Testamentis senior *Apostolorum discipulus* disputabat,' so that here Irenaeus has ceased to quote the discourse. But equally in the middle of the discourse (iv. 28. 1) we have *ostendebant presbyteri*. Probably both these expressions refer to Papias's book, as they cannot belong to the sermon we attribute to Pothinus.

Presbyters in the letter to Florinus: *Ταῦτα τὰ δόγματα οἱ πρὸ ἡμῶν πρεσβύτεροι, οἱ καὶ τοῖς ἀποστόλοις συμφοιτήσαντες, οὐ παρέδωκάν σοι. Εἶδον γάρ σε παῖς ὢν ἔτι ἐν τῇ κάτω Ἀσίᾳ παρὰ τῷ Πολυκάρπῳ, κτλ.* A little further down Polycarp is referred to as *ἐκεῖνος ὁ μακάριος καὶ ἀποστολικὸς πρεσβύτερος*.

4. Papias, 'the hearer of John, and companion of Polycarp, a man of old time' (v. 33. 4), is very likely quoted as 'senior apostolorum discipulus' (iv. 32. 1, probably *πρεσβύτερος* rather than *πρεσβύτερης* being the Greek), as I have just said in a note; but of course Polycarp may be meant.

5. The informants of Papias are often quoted (and here is our most important point) as *πρεσβύτεροι*. This is precisely what Papias himself called them. Did Papias mean Apostles, as Bardenhewer thinks? The answer given by St. Irenaeus is decisive:—

(α) ii. 22. 5 *Καὶ πάντες οἱ πρεσβύτεροι μαρτυροῦσιν, οἱ κατὰ τὴν Ἀσίαν Ἰωάννη τῷ τοῦ Κυρίου μαθητῇ συμβεβληκότες...*

(β) iv. 28. 1 'Ostendebant presbyteri'.

(γ) v. 5. 1 *Λέγουσιν οἱ πρεσβύτεροι τῶν ἀποστόλων μαθηταί.*

(δ) vi. 33. 3 'Quemadmodum presbyteri meminērunt qui Ioannem discipulum Domini viderunt, audisse se ab eo'.

(ε) v. 36. 1 *Ὡς οἱ πρεσβύτεροι λέγουσι.*

(ς) v. 36. 2 'Presbyteri, Apostolorum discipuli'.

(η) v. 30. 1 *Μαρτυρούντων αὐτῶν ἐκείνων τῶν κατ' ὄψιν τὸν Ἰωάννην ἐωρακότων.*

In the last passage the word *πρεσβύτεροι* does not occur; but I have quoted it because it obviously refers

to the same persons. Of these extracts ϵ alone is unimportant for our purpose. A passage evidently intended against a seemingly Marcionite dualism is introduced by β , and this could hardly be attributed to an Apostle. In α , δ , and η the presbyters are those who had seen John the disciple of the Lord,—St. Irenaeus means the Apostle,—‘who remained to them until the time of Trajan’ (ii. 22. 5 and iii. 3. 4). In γ and ζ the presbyters are the disciples of the Apostles. It is certain that in some of these passages Irenaeus is citing Papias. I myself believe that he is probably in all of them citing Papias’s words, and giving them greater importance by ascribing them to ‘the Presbyters’ in general on the ground that in Papias’s prologue that author had declared that he was but writing down their common witness. Still it does not matter for our purpose if some of the passages are not from Papias at all, but are independent traditions of the Presbyters which Irenaeus had obtained from some other source. For his witness is perfectly clear: the *πρεσβύτεροι* are invariably the disciples of the Apostles (once a disciple of disciples,—this would usually be *πρεσβύτης*, or *κρείσσων ἡμῶν*, &c.), and never the Apostles themselves. Papias is himself to Irenaeus a disciple of John the Apostle, and therefore he is a *πρεσβύτερος*.

There can be no manner of doubt, therefore, that Irenaeus understood the *πρεσβύτεροι* mentioned in Papias’s prologue to be the disciples of the Apostles and not Apostles.

Eusebius understands the Presbyters to be not Apostles, but disciples of the Apostles.

On this point Dr. Zahn has made an unfortunate mistake, and has misled Dr. Bardenhewer.

Eusebius remarks, says Zahn, that Papias gives us to understand that he was not a hearer of the Apostles, and also that 'Papias . . . acknowledges that he received the sayings of the Apostles from those who followed them'. Zahn comments thus: 'This second expression of his judgement shows yet more clearly than the first, that Eusebius bases himself upon the words of Papias, εἰ δέ που καὶ παρηκολουθηκώς τις τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις ἔλθοι, τοὺς τῶν πρεσβυτέρων ἀνέκρινον λόγους. He understands then, as results with clearness from the two sentences quoted, by the men, thrice called οἱ πρεσβύτεροι and never otherwise by Papias, "the holy Apostles"' (*Forschungen*, vi, p. 122).

This is extraordinary: (1) Papias clearly declares that he himself knew the Presbyters; ὅσα ποτὲ παρὰ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων καλῶς ἔμαθον καὶ καλῶς ἐμνημόνευσα can mean nothing less. (2) Eusebius declares that Papias only received the sayings of the Apostles from those who followed them. (3) Zahn declares that Eusebius understands the Presbyters to be Apostles!

Eusebius must have perfectly well comprehended the distinction of Papias between his primary and secondary sources. Papias says he has written down (A) what he

heard from the Presbyters themselves, *παρὰ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων*, and (B) what those who came from the Presbyters repeated of their discourses. To make Eusebius refer only to the secondary source, as Zahn does, is quite impossible. It is certain that the words of Eusebius declare that Papias, who did know the Presbyters, did not know the Apostles, and consequently that the Presbyters whom he did know were not Apostles. It follows with equal certainty that he understood *τοὺς τῶν πρεσβυτέρων ἀνέκρινον λόγους*, *τί Ἀνδρέας εἶπεν* κτλ. in the second way: 'I asked for the words of the Presbyters, what (they said) Andrew said,' &c.

It is not often that such scholars as Zahn and Bar-denheuer are found in so indefensible a position. But there is even more to be said against it.

Eusebius, a little further on, says that of the two Johns mentioned, Papias numbers the one among the Apostles with Peter and James and Matthew and the rest, while he places the other outside their number, mentioning Aristion before him, 'and plainly calls him a presbyter', *σαφῶς τε αὐτὸν πρεσβύτερον ὀνομάζει*. Eusebius means, of course, that by being called a presbyter he is intentionally distinguished from the Apostles.

Thus there is no room for two opinions as to the view of Eusebius on this question.

No one has ever pretended that any other writer uses *πρεσβυτέροι* to mean Apostles. But it is not superfluous to refer to the use of the word by Clement of Alexandria, in the same sense that we find in Irenaeus, viz. disciples of Apostles, or of disciples of Apostles. For this see Zahn, *Forschungen*, vi, p. 79, notes ², ³, ⁴, ⁵, where the necessary quotations are collected.

It seems that no parallel is to be found for the supposed *πρεσβύτερος* = *ἀπόστολος* of Papias, while Irenaeus and Eusebius are perfectly clear that *πρεσβύτερος* means a disciple of the Apostles. Now both these writers had the book of Papias before them. They judged the matter not from this passage only, but from the entire work. It is impossible that Papias should have meant 'Apostles' when he said 'Presbyters', and yet that neither Irenaeus nor Eusebius should have been able to penetrate his meaning.¹

It should also be remembered that Irenaeus had, no doubt, independent experience of the use of the word 'presbyter' in Asia, and that Eusebius had a larger knowledge of second-century literature than we can have.

So far, therefore, the meaning of these words of Papias appears to be decided beyond controversy.

¹ It may be urged that the word 'Presbyters' in the sense of 'Fathers' might include Apostles, in the mouth of a very early writer. It might, but apparently it does not. It seems rather to have a technical meaning—primitive sub-apostolic witnesses who were not Apostles nor disciples of the Lord but usually disciples of Apostles. They are witnesses to tradition and links. The Apostles are not regarded as links; they are the authentic teachers, the originators of tradition and not a part of it. This is what I gather from Irenaeus and Clement.

Aristion and John were disciples of the Lord.

Scholars, who have not found Papias to be sufficiently amenable to their views, have suggested emendations of the text. It is easy to get rid of two Johns, by the simple expedient of omitting the mention of one of them. Renan and Haussleiter, on opposite sides, have independently suggested the omission of the words ἡ τῆ 'Ιωάννης in the preface of Papias. On the other side it has seemed awkward that Aristion and John the Presbyter should be described by Papias as 'disciples of the Lord'. What is the use, some scholars have felt, of being able to deny that Papias was a disciple of John, the son of Zebedee, if after all he had two disciples of the Lord for his informants? Dr. E. A. Abbott, consequently, declared in 1895 that the words 'disciples of the Lord' were undoubtedly spurious, and were unknown to Eusebius, adding the somewhat wild conjecture, after Renan, that we should read οἱ [τῶν] τοῦ Κυρίου [μαθητῶν] μαθηταί. Professor Bacon has suggested the reading οἱ τούτων μαθηταί, which is perhaps still more violent. Harnack is willing to put up with the text as he finds it, but urges that τοῦ Κυρίου μαθηταί designates Palestinian Christians as opposed to Jews, and does not necessarily imply that Aristion and John had ever seen the Lord.¹

¹ *Chronol.* i, pp. 660-1.

It is difficult to suppose that any of these suggestions are to be taken quite seriously. But in 1902 the late Professor Mommsen lent the weight of his unrivalled authority to the notion that the words τοῦ Κυρίου μαθηταί are an interpolation.¹ They were known to Rufinus and to Jerome, but they are passed over by the ancient Syrian translator,² and are not cited by Nicephorus Callisti. It must indeed be admitted to be just possible that the text of Eusebius had been already corrupted (from Irenaeus?) before it was used by Rufinus and Jerome, however unlikely this may seem.

1. The arguments of Mommsen are, however, not very strong. The Syriac translation is so free that its testimony on such a point is of little value. Nicephorus might most naturally pass over the repetition as unnecessary and ugly³ (. . . ἡ Ματθαῖος ἢ τις ἕτερος τῶν τοῦ Κυρίου μαθητῶν, ἃ τε Ἀριστίων καὶ ὁ πρεσβύτερος Ἰωάννης, τοῦ Κυρίου μαθηταί, λέγουσιν). On textual grounds it is safer to follow the Greek MSS. (which are unanimous), supported by the fourth-century testimony of Jerome and Rufinus.

2. But it is said that Eusebius implies the absence of the words. This is a mistake. It may easily be seen, on the contrary, that he implies their presence. He quotes the words of Papias, and then makes the comment: 'And Papias, of whom we are now speaking, confesses that he received the words of the Apostles

¹ *Zeitschrift für N.-T. Wissenschaft*, 1902, 2, p. 156, 'Papianisches'.

² Rufinus has *ceterique discipuli*, a careless mistake, such as he is accustomed to make, but one which shows he found the words in his copy.

³ I have just noticed that in copying the whole passage of Papias I happened to omit precisely these words!

from those who had followed them, but says that he himself was a hearer of Aristion and the Presbyter John. In fact (γούν) he mentions them frequently by name, and records their traditions in his writings.' There is not a word here to suggest that Eusebius looked upon Aristion and the Presbyter John as disciples of the Apostles and not as disciples of the Lord.¹ On the contrary, they are placed side by side with the Apostles by Eusebius as by Papias, as though their traditions were of the same directness, though of inferior dignity.² In fact Eusebius seems to distinguish between 'those who followed' the Apostles on the one hand, and Aristion and the Presbyter John on the other. This impression is amply confirmed further on, when Eusebius says: 'Papias also hands down in his own work

¹ Mommsen writes: 'Es kommt hinzu dass Eusebius weiterhin ausdrücklich sagt, dass Papias die apostolischen Äusserungen auf indirectem Wege erhalten (Παπίας τοὺς μὲν τῶν ἀποστόλων λόγους παρὰ τῶν αὐτοῖς παρηκολουθηκότων ὁμολογεῖ παρειληφέναι), dagegen die des Aristion und des Presbyter Johannes, die er häufig namentlich anführte, selber gehört habe (Ἀριστίωνος δὲ κτλ.). Dies ist schlechthin unvereinbar mit der Bezeichnung dieser Männer als οἱ τοῦ Κυρίου μαθηταί.' This unaccountable remark gives the real base of Mommsen's view! Yet it is obvious that Eusebius in the words quoted distinguishes John and Aristion both from the Apostles on the one hand and from followers of the Apostles on the other. He regards them as disciples of the Lord who were not Apostles. How Mommsen came to write this sentence is a mystery.

² Eusebius had introduced the quotation with the similar words: Αὐτός γε μὴν ὁ Παπίας κατὰ τὸ προοίμιον τῶν αὐτοῦ λόγων, ἀκροατὴν μὲν καὶ αὐτόπτην οὐδαμῶς ἐαντὸν γενέσθαι τῶν ἱερῶν ἀποστόλων ἐμφαίνει, παρειληφέναι δὲ τὰ τῆς πίστεως παρὰ τῶν ἐκείνοις γνωρίμων διδάσκει, δι' ὧν φησὶ λέξεων' where παρὰ τῶν ἐκείνοις γνωρίμων declares that Papias's knowledge of the Apostles was at second hand, but does not imply necessarily that his knowledge of our Lord's actions and words was at third hand. It is not excluded by this expression that Papias was acquainted with two disciples of the Lord (and of the Apostles) who were not Apostles.

other narratives (*διηγήσεις*) of the words of the Lord [on the authority] of the aforesaid Aristion, and traditions of the Presbyter John.' Here again Aristion and John are not witnesses to the words and traditions of the Apostles, but Aristion relates words of the Lord, and John gives his own 'traditions'.

Eusebius supplies us with an example of the latter. He tells us the origin of the Gospel of St. Mark on the authority of 'the Presbyter'; and in this 'tradition' the Presbyter judges of the accuracy of the Gospel, not by the testimony of Apostles and eyewitnesses whom he had known, but authoritatively, as one who would be recognized as knowing better than Mark, being himself an eyewitness and disciple of the Lord.

Not merely, therefore, are Dr. Abbott, Professor Bacon, Dr. Mommsen, and others mistaken in thinking that Eusebius could not have read *τοῦ Κυρίου μαθηταί*, but there are actually abundant indications that he found and accepted the words, and that he did not doubt that Aristion and John were really 'disciples of the Lord'.

3. We can go further back than Eusebius. The testimony of St. Irenaeus may be suspected by those who accept Eusebius's distinction between the two Johns, because St. Irenaeus certainly identified them. But his evidence has a force of its own, even if we suppose him to have been mistaken in this identification. He regularly speaks of the Apostle John as 'the disciple of the Lord', and frequently when he seems to be citing Papias.¹ Now I argue that in St. Irenaeus's time it would have been far more natural to speak of 'John, the Apostle', or at least 'John, the beloved disciple'.

¹ See the examples and references further on, p. 42.

I think it is evident that he must be following Papias, unless he is exhibiting the usual custom of Asia, that is of Papias's circle. Now if Papias really distinguished two Johns, it is certain that he said a great deal about the Presbyter, and probably he mentioned the Apostle but little. It will in this case be the Presbyter that he habitually designated 'the disciple of the Lord', and St. Irenaeus would seem to be a witness to this custom on the part of Papias or of Papias's circle.

4. But the palmary argument, if more is needed, is to be found in the words of Papias themselves: *Εἰ δέ που καὶ παρηκολουθηκώς τις τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις ἔλθοι, τοὺς τῶν πρεσβυτέρων ἀνέκρινον λόγους, τί Ἀνδρέας ἢ τί Πέτρος εἶπεν, ἢ τί Φίλιππος, ἢ τί Θωμᾶς ἢ Ἰάκωβος, ἢ τί Ἰωάννης ἢ Ματθαῖος, ἢ τις ἕτερος τῶν τοῦ Κυρίου μαθητῶν· ἃ τε Ἀριστίων καὶ ὁ πρεσβύτερος Ἰωάννης, τοῦ Κυρίου μαθηταί, λέγουσιν.*

Before giving the interpretation of these words, I quote a note of Harnack's on the subject¹: 'Ich halte es nicht für wahrscheinlich, dass der Satz ἃ τε Ἀριστίων κτλ. dem Sinne nach dem πρεσβυτέρων λόγους ebenso untergeordnet ist, wie der Satz τί Ἀνδρέας κτλ., vielmehr meine ich, dass er ihm parallel ist.' This seems to be perfectly correct. We must understand: 'I used to inquire for the words of the Presbyters (viz. what they related that Andrew and Peter, &c., said), and [I used to inquire] what Aristion and John are saying.' Thus τί Ἀνδρέας . . . εἶπεν κτλ. is expegetical of λόγους, representing what those words related, while ἃ τε Ἀριστίων καὶ Ἰωάννης . . . λέγουσιν is co-ordinate with λόγους, and hence the apparent change of construction from the

¹ *Chronologie*, p. 660, note.

indirect question introduced by *τί* to the relative clause introduced by *ἃ*. From *τί Ἀνδρέας* to *μαθητῶν* is a parenthesis explaining *λόγους*. The simple construction is *τοὺς τῶν πρεσβυτέρων ἀνέκρινον λόγους, ἃ τε Ἀριστίων καὶ Ἰωάννης λέγουσιν*.

A. The result of this analysis of the construction is to show clearly that John the Presbyter and Aristion are not co-ordinated with the Apostles, but with the Presbyters, and this is an exceedingly important result. 'If any happened to come who was a follower of the Presbyters, I used to inquire the words of the Presbyters . . . and what Aristion and John the Presbyter are saying.' It is assumed that the Presbyters apparently (at least for the most part), and Aristion and John certainly, were alive at the time the questions were asked. This time was evidently now long ago when Papias wrote. He writes for a new generation, which knows no Presbyters and has no Aristion or John, about the days of his youth when he collected their sayings at first hand when he could, or when he could not, at second hand.

B. John and Aristion are not merely co-ordinated with the Presbyters as surviving, but are lumped together with them, since Papias inquired of any 'who was a follower of the Presbyters' what John and Aristion are saying ; so that followers of John and Aristion are roughly included among followers of the Presbyters.

C. But Aristion and John are also marked off from 'the Presbyters' as well as lumped together with them. It is not that Aristion is not called 'the Presbyter' ; for if John has that title attributed to him to distinguish him from John the Apostle, it does not follow that

Aristion was not also a Presbyter. But 'the words of the Presbyters' for which Papias inquired were nothing but relations of the words of the Apostles, while Papias did not ask what Aristion or John said that the Apostles had said, but what they themselves were saying.

The distinction is clear. 'The Presbyters' could only relate what they had heard from the Apostles; Aristion and the elder John could relate what they themselves remembered. And this is borne out by the passage already quoted, where Eusebius says that Papias related the διηγήσεις of Aristion and the παραδόσεις of John. Thus there is no doubt that Papias singles out Aristion and John as 'disciples of the Lord', which the Presbyters,—we might almost say the other Presbyters,—were not.¹

We have thus arrived at certainty on two important points, viz. that the 'Presbyters' as a class are not the Apostles but their disciples, and that Aristion and John are disciples, not of the Apostles, but of the Lord.²

¹ If any one should prefer to take ἃ τε Ἀριστίων κτλ. as co-ordinate with τί Ἀνδρέας κτλ., the same result will ensue, for in that case Aristion and John are themselves co-ordinated with the Apostles as primary sources of information; 'I asked what the Presbyters said that Peter, Andrew, &c., said, and what [they said that] Aristion and John say.' But the Greek seems to demand the view taken in the text with Harnack (so also Corssen, *Z. für N.-T. Wiss.* 1901, ii, p. 209, note); besides, the present λέγουσιν is unaccountable except on the hypothesis that John and Aristion were living,—Why then ask for their sayings at third hand, rather than at second hand?

² The apparent contradiction that 'John the Presbyter' is yet not strictly one of the class of Presbyters, though he is lumped together with them and receives this special title, will be presently explained by the obvious distinction that 'the Presbyter' is a sort of cognomen or title which distinguishes him from Presbyters in the general sense.

The evidence for each of these results has been complete and full, and the question need not be raised again.

The way is now clear for the discussion of the fundamental question: 'Were there two Johns, or was there one only?'

Papias knew John the Presbyter and Aristion personally.

It is best to interpolate here the proof that Papias was really a hearer of the two disciples of the Lord, John the Presbyter and Aristion. This has been doubted in England by Canon V. H. Stanton, and in Germany by P. Corssen, to name no others.¹ Both find their ground for hesitation in the words of Eusebius: Ἀριστίωνος δὲ καὶ τοῦ πρεσβυτέρου Ἰωάννου αὐτήκοον ἑαυτὸν φησι γενέσθαι ὀνομαστὶ γοῦν πολλάκις αὐτῶν μνημονεύσας ἐν τοῖς αὐτοῦ συγγράμμασιν τίθησιν αὐτῶν παραδόσεις (iii. 39. 7). Dr. Stanton says: 'Eusebius himself appears to be doubtful about his interpretation of the words, for he adds, "At any rate (γοῦν) he often refers to them (Aristion and the Elder John) by name, and quotes also their traditions in his book"'.²

i. But it is not necessary to translate γοῦν 'at any rate', 'at least'; it is more natural to render it by 'in fact'. Γοῦν simply introduces instances, and means 'that is to say', *en effet*, though the context frequently may suggest the sense 'at all events'.² Here this latter sense seems

¹ Stanton, *The Gospels as Historical Documents*, i, p. 169; Corssen, *Z. für N.-T. Wiss.* 1901, p. 208. Similarly C. H. Turner, in *J. T. S.*, Oct. 1908, p. 24, note.

² I am quite aware that Liddell and Scott call γοῦν a 'restrictive particle', and that schoolboys habitually construe it 'at all events'. Nevertheless, even in classical Greek, its ordinary use is simply to

to be even excluded. Eusebius simply asserts *αὐτήκοον ἐαυτὸν φησι γενέσθαι*, 'he says he heard them person-introduce a proof or example of a preceding statement, without suggesting that this is the only or the principal proof or example, and without implying any doubt whatever. For classical usage let us take the first instance in Thucydides: *τὴν γοῦν Ἀττικὴν ἐκ τοῦ ἐπὶ πλείστον διὰ τὸ λεπτόγεων ἀστασίαστον οὔσαν ἄνθρωποι ᾤκουν οἱ αὐτοὶ αἰεί*. Here this is a *further* instance of the same law which had caused the fertile provinces of Thessaly and Boeotia to be in continual revolution and war. We cannot translate 'Attica, at any rate', as if the preceding generalization were a doubtful one, but 'Attica, to give a converse instance'. So in Eusebius himself *γοῦν* appears: i. 2. 12 *γέγραπται γοῦν*: i. 2. 24 *τὴν γοῦν ἐπὶ τέλει βασιλείαν αὐτοῦ Δαυὶδ ὁ προφῆτης κτλ.*: i. 3. 3 *οὔτε γοῦν πρότερον ἐκφωνηθέν εἰς ἀνθρώπους . . . Μωσῆς κτλ.*: i. 3. 4 *οὐ πρότερον γοῦν κτλ.* These are the first instances I find, and the meaning is in each case 'in fact', not 'at all events'. In the first two Eusebius introduces a prophecy to prove a doctrine laid down. It would be absurd to make *γοῦν* restrictive here! The two others similarly introduce a proof of the holiness of the Name of Jesus, because it was given by Moses to his successor, where Eusebius has certainly no doubt as to the validity of his argument, whether we are impressed by it or not. These first five instances of *γοῦν* (which I find in as many minutes) are sufficient. But *ex abundantia* we will turn to Book III, with which we are dealing. The first five examples are in passages from Josephus (iii. 6, 12-13-16-19, and 8. 1). The context of the last is not given. The other four all introduce instances of a general proposition, and in every one the sense excludes 'at all events'. In iii. 24. 4 *ὁ γοῦν Παῦλος κτλ.* is the principal example of the small amount which the Apostles wrote, for Paul was the most eloquent and capable of them. In iii. 24. 9 *μετὰ γοῦν τὴν τεσσαρακονταήμερον νηστείαν* introduces the proofs from each of the Synoptists that they all express in words that they relate our Lord's ministry only from the imprisonment of John. In iii. 30. 2 *φασὶ γοῦν* (in a citation from Clement) has no context in Eusebius, but in *Strom.* vii. 63 'at all events' would make nonsense. I have therefore not found a passage of Eusebius in which *γοῦν* is restrictive, though no doubt there are such (I have just noticed one by chance in reading Plato); but it will be the sense of the sentence and not the power of the particle which causes the restriction. In many of the above cases the example introduced by *γοῦν* is really the principal proof of the preceding proposition, and we might imagine that *γάρ* could as well have been used. But *γοῦν* properly gives only one example out of several. In the

ally'. He does not say 'he shows', but 'he says'. This could surely not be a reasonable way of expressing the mere fact that 'he often refers to them by name as his authorities'. For Eusebius has just quoted Papias's own statement, that 'whenever any one came from the Presbyters' he was only too glad to inquire at second hand 'what Aristion and John are saying'. We must attribute great denseness to the acute historian, if we suppose that he considered the citation by Papias of many traditions of these two 'disciples of the Lord' as equivalent to a statement that Papias had heard these words from their own lips, and not from the visitors to Hierapolis. It seems clear that Eusebius only intends to confirm a *distinct statement* of Papias, by showing that his *frequent* use of their traditions indicates that his boast of acquaintance with them was no idle exaggeration. We should render: 'But of Aristion and John the Presbyter he says he was a personal hearer,—in fact he seems to show that he really knew them well by the frequency with which he mentions them by name and sets down their traditions in his book.' If Eusebius did not mean this, at least this and nothing else is the natural translation of the Greek, and this and nothing else makes his statement logical and reasonable.

2. When Papias tells us that he used to inquire of

passage of Papias the difference is obvious: *ὁνομαστὶ γάρ* would imply that Eusebius is giving his only (or his chief) justification for the previous statement; *ὁνομαστὶ γούν* introduces an example to confirm the statement. [I do not dogmatize as to the use of *γούν* in classical Greek, for I have not sufficiently investigated the point whether it is more commonly restrictive or not. In later Greek, as Blass points out, it may be equal to *οὖν*.]

visitors to Hierapolis 'the words of the Presbyters . . . and what Aristion and John are saying', he is describing his secondary sources of information. He had previously mentioned as his primary and principal source the Presbyters themselves: *ὅσα ποτὲ παρὰ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων καλῶς ἔμαθον καὶ καλῶς ἐμνημόνευσα*. The visitors only afforded additional and accidental fragments of intelligence: *εἰ δέ που καὶ παρηκολουθηκώς τις τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις ἔλθοι*, 'and further if by chance there should also come some follower of the Presbyters'. Therefore Papias knew the Presbyters personally, and yet he inquired their traditions at second hand; hence there is no improbability in his having acted in the same way with regard to the two 'disciples of the Lord'. They were still alive, for he uses the present *λέγουσιν*. Unless they lived at an extraordinary distance, it would be inexplicable that he should not have taken the trouble to make their personal acquaintance. It appears that John lived at Ephesus, Aristion at Smyrna, great cities to which Hierapolis was linked by an important road. But he could not hear all their interesting sayings with his own ears, so that in great part he trusted to report. As, however, they are carefully distinguished as 'disciples of the Lord' from the general run of anonymous Presbyters, we shall further be inclined to expect a distinct statement on the subject. Such a statement Eusebius expressly declares that he found in Papias's work.

3. Irenaeus seems to have found the same declaration in the book. Eusebius says categorically *αὐτήκοον ἑαυτόν φησι γενέσθαι*; Irenaeus calls Papias *Ἰωάννου ἀκουστής*.¹ It is clear that Eusebius is not citing Ire-

¹ v. 33. 3 and ap. Euseb. *H. E.* iii. 39. 1; Eusebius in his Chronicle

naeus, who does not say that Papias made any statement. But the likeness of *αὐτήκοον* to *ἀκουστής* suggests that both are echoing the same assertion of Papias, who will not have spoken of 'knowing' or 'seeing' or 'resorting to' or 'meeting', but of 'hearing' the last survivors of the Lord's disciples.

It does not appear from Eusebius that Papias gave any *διηγήσεις* or *παραδόσεις* of other Apostles or disciples of the Lord (for any such would certainly have been mentioned by the historian), but only stories about them. This of itself confirms the inference from Papias's words that John and Aristion were his contemporaries. Their importance above the Presbyters is suggested by his frequent citation of them 'by name'. The Presbyters as a whole seem to have been quoted by him anonymously.¹ They had no more importance in themselves than had their disciples who visited Hierapolis. They were merely links in the chain of tradition; they were but the cord of the telephone which connected Papias with the Apostles and disciples of the Lord.

It was perhaps unnecessary to linger so long over a point which is amply conceded by Mommsen and Harnack. But later on we shall find it important to be able to use without hesitation the fact that John and Aristion were known to Papias.

(Trajan I, ap. Syncellum) calls Papias a hearer of John, but is evidently dependent on Irenaeus here.

¹ If at all. There is good reason to believe that when Irenaeus refers to 'the Presbyters who had seen John', and so on, he is using a roundabout expression to mean Papias simply. Papias very likely thought it sufficient to refer to his knowledge (both at first and at second hand) of the Presbyters in his preface; possibly he may never have mentioned them again as warrant for particular statements.

Eusebius on John the Presbyter.

It is certain that Eusebius was the first to discover two Johns in Papias, and he is proud of his discovery. Dionysius the Great had distinguished the Apostle who wrote the Gospel from John the author of the Apocalypse, and his acute reasonings are reproduced at length by Eusebius, *H. E.* vii. 25. St. Dionysius confirms the results of internal evidence by mentioning that there were said to be two tombs of John in Ephesus: δύο φασὶν ἐν Ἐφέσῳ γενέσθαι μνήματα καὶ ἐκάτερον Ἰωάννου λέγεσθαι. No other writer informs us of this fact, and we cannot tell whether the rumour was true, and whether there were rival tombs claiming the devotion of the faithful.¹ But Eusebius was pleased with the apparent confirmation of his discovery, and appeals to it when commenting on the two Johns of Papias: 'So that by this also their story is proved to be true who say that there were two of the same name in Asia, and that there

¹ The second tomb is nowhere else mentioned, neither by Poly-crates, nor in the *Acta Ioannis*, nor by Eusebius himself (*Theoph. syr.* iv. 7, ed. Gressmann, p. 175*), nor by Augustine in the well-known passage at the end of his Commentary on St. John, nor by later writers. See also Zahn, *Forsch.* vi. 120. If Eusebius had found any confirmation in the ancients, or from travellers in his own time, he would not have failed to mention it. Mgr. Duchesne says categorically: 'L'histoire des deux tombeaux, mise en avant, comme un on-dit, par Denys d'Alexandrie (*Eus.* vii. 25), n'est pas confirmée par la tradition monumentale d'Éphèse; à Éphèse on n'a jamais parlé que d'un seul sanctuaire et d'un seul Jean' (*Hist. anc. de l'Église*, i, p. 143, note).

are two tombs in Ephesus, and that each of them is even now called the tomb of John.' Eusebius has no other warrant for this than the statement of Dionysius.

The opinion of Eusebius that two Johns were distinguished by Papias is repeated by St. Jerome (*De Viris ill.* 18), but his account is of no interest, except as testifying to the text of Eusebius, for he was personally unacquainted with the work of Papias.

Philippus of Side (ap. De Boor) also quotes the view of Eusebius ; but he again, as may easily be shown, had no independent acquaintance with Papias's book (see p. 95).

Thus we have to regret that we possess no judgement later than Eusebius on the subject by any one who knew what Papias had said in other parts of his ' Interpretations of the Scriptures '. We are driven to examine carefully the arguments of Eusebius himself, after which we must gather what other evidence we can.

Eusebius begins by quoting St. Irenaeus, who calls Papias a hearer of John. To show that he was not a direct hearer of the Apostles, the historian quotes the passage from the prologue, and continues :

Here we may observe that he twice counts the name of John ; the former he enumerates with Peter and James and Matthew and the rest of the Apostles, clearly pointing him out as the Evangelist ; but the other John, postponing the mention of him, he classes with others outside the number of the Apostles, and places Aristion before him ; and he plainly calls him a presbyter.¹

¹ Eusebius may have had this as an afterthought when publishing the final edition of his work, for just before its completion he had written in his Chronicle: 'Ιωάννην τὸν [θεολόγον καὶ] ἀπόστολον Εἰρηναῖος καὶ ἄλλοι ἱστοροῦσι παραμεῖναι τῷ βίῳ ἕως τῶν χρόνων Τραϊανοῦ· μεθ' ὃν Παπίας Ἱεραπολῖτης καὶ Πολύκαρπος Σμύρνης ἐπίσκοπος ἀκουσται αὐτοῦ ἐγνωρίζοντο. (The Greek is preserved by Syncellus. Jerome and the

The remainder of Eusebius's remarks have been already dealt with.

1. Now he is wrong in saying that the second John is in a class outside the number of the Apostles, for we have seen that the clause which enumerates the Apostles is not co-ordinate with that in which Aristion and the Presbyter John are named. It is true that he is classed with Aristion, who is not an Apostle; but Aristion is distinguished from the presbyters, as being a disciple of the Lord. There can be nothing astonishing in an Apostle and a disciple of the Lord being classed together in contradistinction to Presbyters of another generation.

2. Let us suppose that there was only one John—we shall see that the two-fold mention is not in the least unnatural. 'I used to inquire,' says Papias, 'what the Presbyters related about the sayings of (the Apostles), Andrew, Peter, Philip, Thomas, James, John, Matthew, and the others.' The Presbyters were still alive, but presumably all the Apostles were dead except John *ex hypothesi*. The Presbyters related their recollections of the sayings of the twelve in old days. It would be strange if the name of John, the most prominent of all the Apostles after Peter, was not set down. St. Paul is of course omitted, for he had no recollections of Christ to relate.

But *ex hypothesi* one Apostle survived, and also one other disciple of the Lord, who probably lived at Smyrna. Papias used therefore to inquire further 'what Aristion and John are saying'. He naturally

Armenian omit *θεολόγον καί*, which is Syncellus's addition.) We see that here Eusebius simply followed Irenaeus, and said nothing of Papias having known no Apostle but only the Presbyter.

wished to know all that the Presbyters had gathered from John in past days, when they had been with all the Apostles together in Palestine, and also what those who happened still to have the companionship of John and Aristion at Ephesus could gather from these in their old age, to add to the other traditions. We do not know the names of 'the Presbyters'. Polycarp appears to have been one of them, but he was young (21-31) at this time, if we are dealing with years before the death of John, *c.* 90-100, as the date of Papias's inquiries. Papias may then have been at least 25-35.¹ Men who were 40 or 50 at the time of the deaths of St. Peter and St. Paul, *c.* 67, would be 68-78 in 95. The 'Presbyters' were not all in one city, perhaps, and the recollections they related did not refer to what John and Aristion (who were still alive) were now saying, but to what John and the other Apostles used to say in the days when they had been their disciples, thirty, forty, or fifty years earlier. But if any visitor came to Hierapolis from Ephesus, where John lived, and from the city (Smyrna, according to the tradition in *Const. Apost.* vii. 47) where Aristion lived, then Papias inquired for any recent sayings of these disciples of the Lord.

Thus the two-fold mention of John is perfectly natural on the assumption that the Apostle alone is in question.

3. But Eusebius has two further objections. The

¹ If Polycarp was martyred in 155, after being 86 years in the Lord, he was born at latest in 69. Now it does not seem that Papias lived till so late a date as Polycarp. St. Irenaeus evidently never knew him, and calls him ἀρχαῖος ἀνὴρ, a man of old time. He was evidently an old man when he wrote his recollections. We can hardly be wrong in supposing him to have been born before Polycarp, *c.* 65. But 60 is more likely, I think.

second John is mentioned after Aristion, as his inferior, and he is distinctly called a presbyter, not an Apostle.

Now where only two are mentioned together—for these two are not in line with the previously mentioned Apostles—it does not follow that the last place is not the more honourable. The only remaining point in Eusebius's favour is therefore the word *πρεσβύτερος*.

The argument is very strong. Both Johns are 'disciples of the Lord'. The former is declared to be the son of Zebedee, by being named among Apostles and next before Matthew, his fellow-evangelist. The other is carefully distinguished as 'the Presbyter'.

A complete reply is, however, possible.

What is the meaning of the word 'Presbyter' as applied to John? Why is Aristion distinguished by its omission? We have seen that John and Aristion are co-ordinated with 'elders', as informants of Papias's visitors, and are roughly included in the word (p. 25); but that they are distinguished from these elders, as telling their own traditions, not those of the Apostles, and as disciples of the Lord. Aristion is something more than a Presbyter, therefore, and does not receive the title. To John it is not so much a general epithet as a singular title or surname, given evidently in a peculiar sense—he is pre-eminently '*The Presbyter*'.

This might be puzzling if we had no parallel evidence. But we possess two Epistles, invariably associated in MSS. and tradition—including second century tradition, Irenæus, Clement of Alexandria, and the Muratorian Canon—with the name of John.¹ They commence:

¹ Irenæus, Clement, and the Muratorianum each associate one of them at least with the name of John.

ὁ Πρεσβύτερος ἐκλεκτῇ κυρίᾳ καὶ τοῖς τέκνοις αὐτῆς, and again: ὁ Πρεσβύτερος Γαίῳ τῷ ἀγαπητῷ.

This title *Πρεσβύτερος* would apply to many people in the sense of 'elderly man', to many in the technical sense of 'Elder who had known Apostles, or Apostolic men, or their disciples', to many more in the ecclesiastical sense of 'Priest' or 'Bishop'. Yet the author of 2 and 3 John describes himself as ὁ πρεσβύτερος, 'the presbyter,' as if there was no other.

This writer, by his tone of authority, shows that he has a high position. He teaches with confidence. He intends to come to the city of Gaius and rebuke Diotrophes, a leading man in the Church there, 'who loveth to have the pre-eminence.' He writes to a Church, 'the elect lady,' words of warning and counsel. He has no doubt that his dignity is recognized, though he complains of the rebellion of Diotrophes. His title of Presbyter is well understood, and no further explanation is necessary. What is more, his insignificant notes are preserved with care, and one of them (at least) is canonized by the middle of the second century.

John 'the Presbyter', who wrote these epistles, is therefore the same personage as John whom Papias distinguishes from Aristion as 'the Presbyter' *par excellence*.¹ The title was given to him in a singular

¹ Jülicher (*Introd. to the N. T.* Eng. tr. 1903, p. 254) says very well: 'But how can the vague title of "Presbyter" be coupled in the nominative with the dative "to Gaius"? This would only be possible if the person intended was known to every one in the Christian world as the Presbyter κατ' ἐξοχήν, and perhaps better known by this title than by his own name. It is said that there was such an "Elder" of the name of John in the second century. Either this man is the writer of our Epistles or some unknown

sense; and 'the Presbyter' meant John, just as 'the Grand Old Man' meant Mr. Gladstone. It had become a surname.¹

But if this is so, and Presbyter is a kind of surname of honour, it is added to the name John by Papias as an *epitheton ornans*, and its presence is quite to be expected; therefore it need not be intended to distinguish the second John from the first, though it might be so intended. Consequently, the last argument of Eusebius falls to the ground, and the separate existence of John the Presbyter disappears. The proof of his separate existence was simply said to be the clear statement of Papias. If Papias's words can easily be understood otherwise, we are bound so to interpret them as to make them agree with our other authorities, and the second John vanishes into space.

Now let us read the passage of Papias once more, assuming that there is only one John (since, according to the 'razor of Occam', *entia non sunt multiplicanda* person has appropriated his name in order to secure an adequate authority for his disciplinary instructions.)

¹ I have suggested in the *Journal of Theol. Studies* (April, 1904, p. 361) that *πρεσβύτερος* was the official title assumed by St. John as superintendent of the Churches of Asia. He could not be called patriarch, metropolitan, archbishop, for such names were not yet invented. To the Asiatics 'the Apostle' would mean St. Paul, at least when St. John first arrived. 'The ancient' was not an unnatural title to receive or to assume, under the circumstances, and it suits the modesty which is conspicuous in the Gospel of St. John. So in the books of Mr. W. W. Jacobs the skipper is called by his crew 'the old man', as a title, for he might be really young. So in Germany sons call their father, or pupils their teacher 'Der Alte,' though in these cases it is not exactly an honourable epithet. I should not so much compare 1 Peter v. 2 *πρεσβυτέρους οὓν ἐν ὑμῖν παρακαλῶ ὁ συνπρεσβύτερος*, as Philemon 9 (if the reading is admitted) *τοιούτου ὡν ὡς Παῦλος πρεσβύτης, νυνὶ δὲ καὶ δέσμιος*, where age is a title to honour.

praeter necessitatem), viz. the Apostle, commonly called in Asia 'the Presbyter'. The repetition of the name will be seen to have been inevitable, unless John, the beloved disciple, was actually to be omitted in the enumeration of the chief Apostles :

But if it chanced that any came who had been a follower of the Presbyters, I used to inquire the words of the Presbyters, (what they related Andrew or Peter to have said, or Philip or Thomas or James or John or Matthew, or any other of the disciples of the Lord), and the things which Aristion and the 'Patriarch' John, disciples of the Lord, were saying.

Thus John's words are wanted at third hand together with those of the other Apostles, but his latest sayings at second hand also, together with those of Aristion. Nothing surely could be simpler or more natural than the sense and the grammar. The group of Apostles are called 'disciples of the Lord' as being able to testify to His teaching and life at first hand. The same epithet is applied to Aristion and John the aged, for the same reason. It follows that the traditions of Aristion and John are the most important, yet they are kept till the last place ; it would seem that the place of John last of all is in consequence the place of honour. He alone has a special title added, a mark of honour meaning 'the aged' being especially suitable in this context. This surname must either distinguish or identify the two Johns mentioned, according as the readers for whom Papias wrote knew that the Apostle John was or was not the same person as 'John the ancient'.

So far we have simply discovered that there is no need to distinguish. Now we come to the positive grounds of identification, which can at length be allowed their full value.

St. Irenaeus on John the Presbyter.

St. Irenaeus not only was acquainted with the work of Papias, but looked upon it as a fountain-head of apostolical tradition and of theological wisdom. He was certainly more familiar with it than was Eusebius, who despised it. His evidence is, therefore, from this point of view alone, at least equally important with that of Eusebius. Eusebius went to Papias with the idea in his head that John the author of the Apocalypsé could not possibly be John the author of the Gospel. He evidently found in Papias only one passage which seemed to favour his view, or he would have quoted more. This is a point of first-rate importance; for since this single passage does not prove his point, his argument is extremely weak. Irenaeus, on the other hand, had no reason to incline him to misunderstand Papias, if Papias in reality clearly referred to two Johns.

1. As a fact, it is certain that St. Irenaeus understood John the Presbyter to be the same as John the Apostle. He never uses the expression 'John the Presbyter', but he calls Papias 'the hearer of John',¹ meaning the Apostle. Eusebius assures us that the work of Papias showed that he had been a hearer of John the Présbyter,

¹ Ἰωάννου ἀκουστής, v. 33. 4. In *J. T. S.*, Oct., 1907, pp. 56 foll., I showed that Papias is quoted in ii. 22. 5 οἱ κατὰ τὴν Ἀσίαν Ἰωάννη τῷ τοῦ Κυρίου μαθητῇ συμβεβληκότες.

but of no Apostle. Nor does St. Irenaeus say that Papias knew any other Apostle than John,¹ as we shall see.

2. But it is also noticeable that St. Irenaeus regularly calls St. John 'the disciple of the Lord' rather than 'the Apostle',² and it is to 'John, the Lord's disciple' that he attributes the Apocalypse (iv. 20. 11), the Gospel (v. 18. 2; ii. 22. 3; iii. 1. 1; iii. 10. 6; iii. 16. 4, &c.), the first Epistle (iii. 16. 4), and the second Epistle (i. 16. 3 and iii. 16. 8). (In the last case by an oversight St. Irenaeus quotes 'praedicta epistola', which necessarily refers back to iii. 16. 4, where it was 1 John which was quoted.)

Thus St. Irenaeus identifies the author of the Gospel, 'he who lay upon the Lord's breast' (iii. 1. 1), with the author of the Apocalypse and with 'the Presbyter' of the second Epistle, as also with the John of whom Papias was the hearer. He means the Apostle, the son of Zebedee, yet he usually calls him 'the disciple of the Lord'.³

¹ 'Senior apostolorum discipulus,' iv. 32. 1, must not be pressed, if Papias be meant and not Polycarp.

² e. g. i. 8. 4; i. 16. 3; ii. 22. 3 and 5; iii. 1. 1; iii. 3. 4; iii. 10. 6; iii. 11. 13; iii. 16. 4 and 7; iv. 20. 11; v. 18. 2; v. 33. 2.

³ See Gutjahr, *Die Glaubwürdigkeit des Irenäischen Zeugnisses*, (Graz, 1904), p. 3. An admirable table of references by St. Irenaeus to the fourth Gospel is given by Dr. F. G. Lewis, of Chicago, in his brochure, *The Irenaeus Testimony to the Fourth Gospel—its extent, meaning, and value* (Chicago Univ. Press, 1908), pp. 10-12. It appears that Irenaeus cites it as 'the Gospel according to John' twice; as 'the Gospel' twice; as 'John' simply, eleven times; as 'John, the disciple of the Lord' seventeen times; as 'the disciple of the Lord' twice; as 'the Apostle' once (iii. 5. 1), as 'John the Apostle' twice (i. 9. 2 and iii. 11. 9). The last passage is absolute proof that he regarded the writer of the text, 'The Word was made flesh,' as *John, the Apostle, the disciple of the Lord*. Dr. Lewis points out that iii. 3. 4 is hardly less decisive: 'At the close of iii. 3. 4 Irenaeus wrote: "The Church in Ephesus, founded by Paul, and having John remaining among them permanently

3. We have seen in the preceding chapter that Papias gave to John the Presbyter this title, 'the disciple of the Lord,' and we may guess that Irenaeus borrowed the habit from Papias, unless the reader prefers to imagine that he himself brought the phrase from Asia to Gaul, which comes to the same thing. We may compare the 'Ioannes ex discipulis' of the Muratorian fragment, which contrasts so strangely with the 'Andreas ex Apostolis' which closely follows it. The witness of St. Irenaeus is thus complete as to the meaning assigned by himself to the words of Papias: Ἀριστίων καὶ ὁ πρεσβύτερος Ἰωάννης, τοῦ Κυρίου μαθηταί. Irenaeus certainly studied Papias deeply, and quoted him frequently, but he never found out that Papias knew of two distinct Johns.

4. But St. Irenaeus supplies us with further witness of another kind. He had apparently not known

until the times of Trajan, is a true witness of the traditions of the Apostles." The obvious meaning of this statement is that, for Irenaeus, the John of Asia was an Apostle. Taken with the point which has been made above—that Irenaeus recognized only one John of apostolic days other than John the Baptist and John Mark—the statement means that the writer of the Gospel was an Apostle. The passage in ii. 22. 5 c contains similar language and gives the same conclusion' (p. 18). Dr. Lewis refers to six other passages, and concludes: 'This cumulation of evidence places Irenaeus's opinion beyond doubt. The author of the fourth Gospel was as certainly an apostle for him as though he had taken a page to state, argue, and prove the point. He would have been astonished if he could have known that any reader would ever think otherwise. One can hardly believe that those who have been in doubt about the matter have read Irenaeus' (p. 19). The last sentence expresses my own feeling. Yet Dr. Lewis cites the hesitation of Mr. H. L. Jackson, Mr. C. A. Scott, and of Dr. Swete. I admire Dr. Swete so much that I am astonished that his habitual caution should have for once been exaggerated into incautiousness. Compare also Sanday, *Crit. of the Fourth Gospel*, p. 105.

St. Papias, but he well remembered St. Polycarp. He had seen Florinus in company with Polycarp when 'he was a boy', *παῖς ὢν ἔτι* (*Ep. ad Flor.*), but this was not the latest period of his acquaintance with Polycarp, for he speaks elsewhere of having seen him 'in my first age', *ὃν ἡμεῖς ἐωράκαμεν ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ ἡλικίᾳ* (iii. 3. 4). In *J. T. S.*, Oct., 1907, pp. 54-5 and 61, I discussed St. Irenaeus, ii. 22. 5: 'triginta annorum aetas prima est iuvenis et extenditur usque ad quadragesimum annum. Here 'prima aetas' is evidently a translation of *πρώτῃ ἡλικίᾳ*, and is identified with *iuventus*, which was shown in the diagram, *ibid.*, p. 56, to extend precisely from 30-40. Even if St. Irenaeus is trying to exaggerate the age at which he knew Polycarp, we can hardly suppose him to have been less than 25 or thereabouts. He means to say: 'I was able to know him as late as my early manhood,' *ἐπιπολὺ γὰρ ἔμεινε*. The conversation of Polycarp was about his familiarity with John and other Apostles. Three times St. Irenaeus mentions John as known to Polycarp without giving the names of the 'other Apostles':

Ep. ad Vict. ἄτε μετὰ Ἰωάννου τοῦ μαθητοῦ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν, καὶ λοιπῶν ἀποστόλων οἷς συνδιέτριψεν, αἰεὶ τετηρηκότα.

Ep. ad Flor. τὴν μετὰ Ἰωάννου συναναστροφὴν ὡς ἀπήγγελλε, καὶ τὴν μετὰ τῶν λοιπῶν τῶν ἐωρακόντων τὸν Κύριον, καὶ ὡς ἀπεμνημόνευε τοὺς λόγους αὐτῶν καὶ περὶ τοῦ Κυρίου τίνα ἦν ἢ περὶ τῆς διδασκαλίας, ὡς παρὰ τῶν αὐτοπτῶν τῆς ζωῆς τοῦ Λόγου (1 John i. 1) παρεληφώς· κτλ.

Haer. iii. 3. 4 καὶ Πολύκαρπος δὲ οὐ μόνον ὑπὸ Ἀποστόλων μαθητευθεὶς, καὶ συναναστραφεὶς πολλοῖς τοῖς τὸν Χριστὸν ἐωρακόσιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ὑπὸ Ἀποστόλων κατασταθεὶς εἰς τὴν Ἀσίαν ἐν τῇ ἐν Σμύρνῃ ἐκκλησίᾳ ἐπίσκοπος, ὃν καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐωράκαμεν ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ ἡμῶν ἡλικίᾳ, ἐπιπολὺ γὰρ ἔμεινε.

From the last passage we may possibly have a right to gather that St. Polycarp was not originally a Smyrnaean nor an Asiatic, but was sent to Smyrna as bishop by Apostles. *Εἰς τὴν Ἀσίαν* in a post-classical writer need not mean more than *ἐν τῇ Ἀσίᾳ*; but yet the whole form of the sentence and the mention of Asia suggests the translation, which in an earlier writer would be unavoidable: 'was sent into Asia by Apostles, as bishop of the Church of Smyrna.'

If this suggestion be accepted, it is easier to account for Polycarp's acquaintance with other Apostles besides John. It does not appear that Papias could remember Philip the Apostle, who died at Hierapolis, though he knew his daughters. The mention of Andrew the Apostle in Asia by the Muratorian fragment seems to rest upon apocryphal testimony. It does not seem that any Apostle besides John survived in Asia at the close of the first century. But Polycarp may have known Apostles elsewhere in quite early youth. His recollections, however, were principally of St. John, and it is noticeable that St. Irenaeus does not mention his reporting discourses of any other Apostle. If he had known other Apostles in his childhood only,¹ this was a natural consequence. The *ὑπὸ ἀποστόλων μαθητευθείς* of Irenaeus can hardly mean 'was converted by Apostles', as Zahn would have it. Zahn is obliged to suppose Polycarp to have been converted at 13 (!), and after being '86 years in the Lord' (*Mart. Polyc.* 9), to

¹ If he died in 155 his baptism took place in 69, and his birth in that year or not much earlier. He may have had instructions from Apostles in childhood, *c.* 80, and from Apostolic men later still. Still I think it quite possible that 'Apostles' may refer to John and Arision only, where Polycarp's ordination is in question.

have been able to run behind a cart before his martyrdom at the age of 100 years (*ibid.*), not to speak of his undertaking a journey to Rome the year before. Such improbabilities induce us to suppose that he received baptism as an infant, and received his first Christian instruction (a possible meaning of μαθητευθείς) from Apostles in Palestine or elsewhere. He is said to have been made bishop 'by Apostles', and sent to Smyrna by them. It cannot be shown, I think, that Polycarp had known any Apostle besides John in Asia in his mature years.

The witness of Irenaeus about Polycarp, therefore, corresponds to the witness of both Irenaeus and Eusebius about Papias. Neither Polycarp nor Papias had known any Apostle in Asia but John, so far as we can see. Irenaeus is quite clear that Papias meant the Apostle, and only the Apostle. He remembers the words of Polycarp better than recent events, and he has no doubt that Polycarp also spoke of the Apostle.

5. But Irenaeus is also witness to the tradition of Asia Minor in general. We know that he lived there in his youth for some years, since he saw Florinus there with Polycarp, παῖς ὧν ἔτι, i.e. at the age of perhaps 10-15 years, and could remember Polycarp much later, if he is not exaggerating, when he was between 30 and 40. If Polycarp died in 155 Irenaeus can hardly have been born later than 125, and Harnack's date, a little before 142, is absurd. Further, it seems that Irenaeus last saw Polycarp some time before his death, for the Moscow MS. of the *Martyrdom* says that when Polycarp died, Irenaeus was teaching in Rome (see Harnack, *Chronol.* i. 331-2 against this). Certainly 120 is a more likely

date than 125. But we have the statement, v. 30. 3 that the Apocalypse was seen almost in his own generation, οὐδὲ γὰρ πρὸ πολλοῦ χρόνου ἐωράθη, ἀλλὰ σχεδὸν ἐπὶ τῆς ἡμετέρας γενεᾶς πρὸς τῷ τέλει τῆς Δομετιανοῦ ἀρχῆς. Now Harnack thinks the length of a γενεά is given in this passage by the distance from τῷ νῦν καιρῷ (just above) back to the last days of Domitian, viz. about 90 years; in fact he makes the words equivalent to 'almost within the memory of persons still living'. Thus ἡμετέρας would refer to Irenaeus and his readers. But as a fact St. Irenaeus always speaks of himself as ἡμεῖς, and never (I think) of himself and his readers as ἡμεῖς. Especially where he is speaking of Asiatic events of past times, it is to his own recollections that he refers, for he assumes that his readers are either younger, or have not personally received the Asiatic traditions which he prized so highly. He is writing for Gaul, and secondarily, perhaps, for Italy, not for Asia. I think, therefore, that Irenaeus probably means: 'It is not long ago that it was revealed, but almost in my own time, for I come from that part of the world.' But this is not certain, I admit. On the other hand, it is quite certain that 'within our own generation' does not mean 'within the lifetime of people who are now ninety', but 'within the lifetime of people of our time of life'. You cannot imagine a young man speaking to his great-grandfather of 'in our generation'! If Irenaeus was (as Harnack thinks) 45 when he wrote about 185, then 'almost within our own generation' will not carry us back more than 50-60 years, or 70, if he is greatly exaggerating, i. e. to 125-35 or 115; whereas Domitian was killed in 96! For example: a man now 45 was born in 1865. The first railway was

in 1825, but railways were hardly general until 1842, 23 years before his birth. Yet I cannot imagine him saying to-day that 'railways came into use within our own generation'. Still less would he say that the battle of Waterloo, fifty years before his birth, took place 'almost within our own generation'. I must apologize for returning to this point (on which I said something in *J. T. S.*, Oct., 1897, p. 61), because it seemed necessary to add a word in answer to Harnack's curious interpretation of a very simple phrase, which seems to me to imply that Irenaeus was born about 115 (so Zahn). I am inclined to look upon 125 as the very latest date that is open. But he seems to have remembered Hadrian's visit to Asia in 129.

Now his recollections would, presumably cover the period 125-150, or at least 135-50, in Asia. Let us for the sake of argument say 140-55. Even so he must have been in a position to know plenty of people whose recollections went back to the first century.

Secondly, there was a close commerce between the Church of Lyons and the Church of Smyrna. Pothinus, Bishop of Lyons, who was over 90 when he was martyred, *c.* 177, was possibly an Asiatic (born *c.* 87), and he may be the 'disciple of the disciples of the Apostles' whose sermon St. Irenaeus quotes at length (iv. 27 foll.).

Thus any mistake which might (inconceivably) occur in St. Irenaeus's recollections about the identity of John of Ephesus, would immediately be checked by others of his contemporaries and friends. He was not isolated, as Harnack conceives him.¹

¹ So Dr. Drummond had pointed out: 'Critics speak of Irenaeus as though he had fallen out of the moon,' p. 348.

§ 9

*Early witnesses to the identity of the Presbyter
and the Apostle.*

1. There seems to be no doubt that Papias was much read by the early Church, though it is very difficult to trace his influence. His chiliastic views, however, had a wide echo in East and West, and many of the statements about the Gospels made by early writers can be traced back to him, or have been influenced by his traditions. He was probably used by St. Justin Martyr, more certainly by Clement of Alexandria, possibly by Tertullian, Cyprian, Victorinus, Commodian, Lactantius, and even Tichonius. He must have been much read by those numerous writers of the second century whose works were still preserved in the time of Eusebius, and through them he must have influenced a host of other writers. A scholar of great reputation lately repeated to me with approval the remark of another first-rate authority, that when we find the works of Papias, we shall recognize that we knew a great part of them already, as was the case with Aristides.

Yet in none of the ancient literature which has come down to us is there any vestige of the existence of more than one John at Ephesus, apart from the conjectures of Dionysius and Eusebius, which have occasionally been quoted by later writers.

2. The witness of St. Justin Martyr is of extraordinary

weight. He represents his dialogue as taking place at Ephesus itself about the years 130-5. His knowledge of Ephesian matters dates from that time, though he wrote later (155-60). He states (*Dial.* 81) that the Apocalypse was the prophecy of a Christian of the name of John, one of the Apostles of Christ: καὶ ἔπειτα καὶ παρ' ἡμῶν ('amongst us' Christians, as opposed to the Old Testament prophecies just cited) ἀνὴρ τις, ᾧ ὄνομα Ἰωάννης, εἰς τῶν ἀποστόλων Χριστοῦ, ἐν ἀποκαλύψει γενομένη αὐτῷ . . . προεφήτευσεν. Now the Apocalypse is addressed to the seven Churches of Asia, of which Ephesus was the first, by a John who was in exile for the faith in Patmos. So Justin's testimony amounts to a statement that John the Apostle was at one time head of the Churches of Asia Minor, and was at some date or other exiled to Patmos.

This entirely harmonizes with the distinct and incontrovertible testimony of St. Irenaeus that St. John the Apostle wrote the Apocalypse, and that he lived at Ephesus until the reign of Trajan. It may also incline us to accept St. Irenaeus's further witness that the date of the Apocalypse and of St. John's exile to Patmos was under Domitian, which, in fact, is almost universally accepted to-day.¹

¹ This was true in 1903 (see Moffatt, *The Historical N. T.*, p. 461, for a list of authorities; to these Dr. Swete must be added). But there has been a recrudescence of the Neronian theory since then. In 1907 Dr. Sanday uttered a mild protest against the first symptoms (*J. T. S.*, July, 1907, pp. 486 foll.). But in his preface to Hort's posthumous lectures on the Apocalypse he was inclined to hedge. Dean Armitage Robinson replied in favour of tradition (*J. T. S.*, Oct., 1908, pp. 6 foll.). The question does not matter in the least to my present argument. But on one point I have a word to say. Bishop Chase (*J. T. S.*, April, 1907, p. 431) has revived the idea that St. Irenaeus (v. 30. 3) does not state that 'the Apocalypse was seen not long ago, but almost in our own generation, towards the end of

It also entirely harmonizes with the fact that Papias of Hierapolis was personally acquainted with St. John the Apostle. Nay, I wish to say most emphatically that Justin's witness, joined to that of Irenaeus, makes it *a priori* impossible that Papias should not have known the Apostle.

3. Pölycrates, Bishop of Ephesus in the last years of the second century, writes to Pope Victor¹ of the great personages buried in Asia: Philip, one of the twelve Apostles, and one of his daughters at Hierapolis, the reign of Domitian', but that he means 'the author of the Apocalypse was seen'. Bishop Chase is starting from a suggestion by Dr. Hort, and Dr. Hort was half approving the argument of a Swiss writer, J. Bovon, whose words have been reprinted in Hort's *Apocalypse* (1908), p. 41. Now Dr. Hort and Dr. Chase are great authorities, but in spite of them I venture to think the suggested translation impossible, and their advocacy of it a misfortune. For twice St. Irenaeus elsewhere appeals to the witness of St. John's last days; once, when speaking of the Presbyters: *παρέμεινε γὰρ αὐτοῖς μεχρὶ τῶν Τραϊανοῦ χρόνων* (ii. 22. 5, ap. Eus. *H. E.* iii. 25), and again of the Church of Ephesus: *Ἰωάννου δὲ παραμείναντος αὐτοῖς μεχρὶ τῶν Τραϊανοῦ χρόνων* (iii. 3. 4, ap. Eus. iii. 23). In both places the point is St. John's witness continued until his death. It is therefore inconceivable that in v. 30. 3 the same writer should have limited the time when St. John 'was seen' (even if we follow Dr. Chase in explaining 'was seen about', as though he was after that too old to leave his room) to the end of the reign of Domitian! I do not at all understand how any one could put forward such a translation of St. Irenaeus. On the other hand, we have the *ἐωράθη* taking up the *ἐωρακότος* which had just preceded, and the last years of Domitian give us precisely (it cannot be a mere coincidence) the time of persecution, followed (as Victorinus and Jerome point out) by the reversal of Domitian's decrees by the senate, and the return of the Apostle to Ephesus (Clem. Al., Origen, Victorinus, Eusebius, Jerome, &c.). There are so many real difficulties in interpreting our ancient authorities that I hope this confusing and annoying mistranslation will not appear any more. I notice, by the way, that Canon J. J. Scott, in some popular lectures in Manchester Cathedral (Murray, 1909), prefers the Neronian date.

¹ Euseb. *H. E.* iii. 31. 3, and v. 24. 2-3.

other at Ephesus; 'John, who lay upon the Lord's breast, who was a Priest wearing the "petalon", and martyr and doctor, he sleeps in Ephesus'; Polycarp, Thraseas, Sagaris, Papirius, and Melito. Polycrates in 195 or thereabouts, was 65 years old, so that he was born about 130. He says that he was the eighth bishop in Asia of his family, so that the witness of his family carries us much further back, possibly as much as a hundred years. He cannot have made any mistake about the identity of John, who lived until the age of Trajan, and scarcely even about that of Philip, who died much earlier (since he is mentioned first, and also since he was apparently unknown personally to Papias). Now Polycrates makes the famous John of Ephesus the author of the Gospel, for he lay on Jesus's breast; he certainly therefore assumes that he is the Apostle, since in 195 it was common to all Churches that the Apostle wrote the Gospel. Again, he makes him the author of the Apocalypse, for he calls him *μάρτυς*, which must be a reference to his exile to Patmos—the verification of the prophecy that he should drink the Lord's chalice. As writer of the Apocalypse John would be the Superior of the seven Churches of Asia, and it is in this capacity, perhaps, that it is said of him *ἐγενήθη ἱερεὺς τὸ πέταλον πεφορεκώς*, but this is somewhat mysterious. The addition *καὶ διδάσκαλος* apparently claims him as the author of the Paschal traditions of Ephesus.

So we have from Ephesus a tradition which is as authentic as that of Lyons, and it is absolutely the same in its testimony. There is entire harmony between Justin at Rome, Irenaeus in Gaul, and Polycrates in Asia.

4. The spurious Acts of John were composed in Asia by Leucius about 160-70. They embroider the traditional data with many legendary additions. But it is difficult to suppose that Leucius ventured to contradict any facts that were well known when he wrote, seventy years or so after the accession of Trajan. There might still be aged men living who could remember to have seen the John who lived at Ephesus until Trajan. His identity, his writings, and his tomb cannot have been doubtful matters, and, in fact, Leucius is entirely in harmony with Polycarp and Papias, Justin and Irenaeus and Polycrates. The tomb at Ephesus is for him that of the Apostle, the son of Zebedee, who is the author of the Gospel and of the Apocalypse. He visits the seven Churches in the order in which the letters occur in the Apocalypse. He lays himself down in his tomb. The evidence is very full in the fragments (Zahn, *Forsch.* vi, pp. 14-18, 194-200).

5. The adverse witness of Gaius and the Alogi is to be noted.¹ They do not deny that John the Apostle

¹ Jülicher admits: 'Only the Alogi of Asia Minor rejected it, even before the end of the second century, but that was scarcely on the ground of better or even of divergent tradition.' *Introd. to the N. T.*, Eng. tr. 1903, p. 403. There is no proof whatever that they were a sect in Asia Minor. I am inclined to think that the best name for them is Gaius and Co. It is, anyhow, certain that Gaius rejected the Gospel as well as the Apocalypse. The passage published by the Rev. T. H. Robinson, B.D., in the *Expositor* for June, 1906, p. 487, from Bar Salibi's Commentary on the Apocalypse, is of the first importance, especially the words: 'Hippolytus of Rome states that a man named Gaius had appeared, who said that neither the Gospel nor yet the Revelation was John's, but that they were the work of Cerinthus the heretic.' There seems to be no reason to doubt that the nameless heretics to whom St. Epiphanius gave the name of Alogi (he knew them solely through Hippolytus), were nothing else than Gaius. How Epiphanius did not discover that

was at Ephesus. On the contrary, they seem to assume it, for they attribute the composition of his Gospel and his Apocalypse to his opponent Cerinthus. This was not because the teaching of Cerinthus was found in those books, but the Alogi simply rejected them (out of opposition to the Montanists as well as to the Chiliasts, as it appears) and said they were not what John taught, but forgeries in his name by his enemy. This is clear in what Gaius says of the Apocalypse: *Κήρινθος ὁ δι' ἀποκαλύψεων ὡς ὑπὸ ἀποστόλου μεγάλου γεγραμμένων τερατολογίας ἡμῖν ὡς δι' ἀγγέλων αὐτῷ δεδειγμένας ψευδόμενος ἐπεισάγει* (Euseb. *H. E.* iii. 28. 2). We learn from Hippolytus, cited by Bar Salibi, that Gaius also rejected the Gospel. He, i. e. the Alogi of St. Epiphanius, of course thought that Cerinthus pretended to be St. John, the disciple who lay on the Lord's breast. It is most natural, therefore, to suppose that Gaius presumed Cerinthus to have taken the fact that the 'great Apostle' lived in Asia and was exiled to Patmos as the basis of his forgery. Consequently, Gaius is an adverse witness

Gaius was the person against whom Hippolytus was arguing, we need not inquire, for the learned Epiphanius was capable of any amount and quality of confusion and muddleheadedness. It is scarcely possible that Gaius's dialogue should have been written earlier than the third book of St. Irenaeus (if I am right in supposing that Gaius replied to the letter of Polycrates or to a Montanist imitation of it—as I shall say further on). Consequently, we can hardly assume that St. Irenaeus in iii. 11. 9 is referring to the dialogue against Proclus. But he may be referring to the opinions of Gaius all the same, for Gaius was presumably well known at Rome as an opponent of the Montanists before he published his dialogue. If this be so then we must read *pseudoprophetas esse nolunt* for *pseudoprophetae esse uolunt* with Zahn (*G. K.* i. 244; cp. his defence of this emendation, *ibid.* ii. 972; also *Forschungen*, v. 45). There seems, I repeat, no reason to imagine any 'Alogi' in Asia; they were Romans.

to the authenticity of the Johannine writings (though a poor one!), but not to the stay of St. John the Apostle in Ephesus or his 'martyrdom' by exile in Patmos.

6. It is scarcely necessary to quote Clement of Alexandria. It is sufficiently well known that he witnesses to Gospel, Apocalypse, and two Epistles as Johannine. His story of the robber is an additional witness. But in general his testimony is weakened both by his habitual use of forged Acts of Apostles and by his citation of the Leucian Acts of John in particular in his *Adumbratio* on 1 John. Still we must not forget that one of his teachers was from Asia, and therefore he may be regarded at least as a witness that the apocryphal legends did not contradict the main data of Asiatic tradition. The explicit witness of Tertullian (about 199) is more important.¹ That of Apollonius is from Asia, and a few years earlier.² I might argue also from smaller points, such as the commentary on the Gospel by Heracleon, and on the Apocalypse by Melito. I prefer to deal with the larger matters. Origen's witness is too obvious to be insisted on: it sums up the early tradition.

7. The adverse witness of St. Dionysius the Great is interesting. He had heard that there were two tombs at Ephesus, but he had not heard that there were two Johns known there. He assumes it as certain that John the Apostle died and was buried there. He has nothing to go upon but Gaius, whose words he carefully tones down. His literary criticism is very able, but he has

¹ 'Sicut Smyrnaeorum ecclesia Polycarpum ab Ioanne collocatum refert' (*Praescr.* 32). Of course Tertullian means the Apostle; he knows no other Apostolic John.

² Apollonius spoke of John raising the dead at Ephesus. Eusebius understood him to mean the Apostle (*H. E.* v. 18. 14).

no tradition behind him. He is, therefore, not really an adverse witness.

8. St. Victorinus (martyred *c.* 303?) is a very important witness, first, because his testimony is so definite; secondly, because he was a great admirer and reader of Papias; and thirdly, because his words must go back to some earlier authority.¹ According to St. Jerome (Ep. 71. 2, and 84. 7) Victorinus simply wrote out Origen in Latin and called the result his own composition. He seems to have done the same with Papias, both in *De Fabrica mundi* and in the millenarian conclusion of the notes on the Apocalypse. His authority as to St. John's history may have been Hippolytus.²

¹ When Dr. Hort delivered his recently published lectures it was possible to doubt the authenticity of the notes of Victorinus on the Apocalypse. Though Vallarsi rejected St. Jerome's letter to Anatolius, describing his new edition of the commentary, no one who knows St. Jerome's style can doubt its authenticity. We can now, through Haussleiter's discovery of the MS. Vat. lat. 3288 A, restore the pre-Hieronymian form of the commentary. I cite from that codex the most important passage, adding punctuation: '*Oportet*, inquit, *iterum* praedicare, id est *prophetare*, in *populis linguis et nationibus* (Apoc. x. 11), hoc est quoniam quando hoc uidit Iohannes, erat in insula Patmo^a in metallo damnatus a Cesare Domitiano. Ibi ergo uidetur Iohannes apocalipsim scripsisse. Et cum iam seniore se putasset post passionem recipi posse, interfecto Domitiano, omnia iudicia eius soluta sunt, et Iohannes a metallo dimissus est, et sic postea tradidit hanc eandem apocalipsim quam a domino acceperat: hoc est *iterum prophetare oportet*. Et accepisse autem illum *harundinem similem uirgae ut metiret templum Dei et aram et adorantes in ea* potestate domini (xi. 1), quam dimissus postea exhibuit ecclesiis, nam et evangelium postea conscripsit. Cum essent enim Valentinus et Cerinthus et Hebion^b et ceterae scholae sparsae per orbem^c, conuenerunt ad illum de finitimis ciuitatibus episcopi, et compulerunt eum.'

² Hippolytus is not to be passed over, for the greater part of St. Epiphanius's disquisition on the Alogi (*Haer.* 51) is borrowed

^a Pactha. ^b Hesbion. ^c ceteras scholas sparsas per urbem.

9. No witness is more important than Eusebius himself, for his knowledge of early literature was unique. He could find only two authorities for attributing the Apocalypse to any one but St. John the Apostle. The one was Gaius, and he is afraid to use his witness, but quotes him as though it were some unknown Apocalypse which he attributed to Cerinthus—or he may possibly have really failed to understand. His other authority, the only one which he brings forward, is the

from his defence of the fourth Gospel. Now Epiphanius tells us (51. 2) that when Ebion and Cerinthus (cp. Victorinus) were teaching heresy in Asia, St. John was inspired to write his Gospel against them, and again (51. 12): Διὸ ὕστερον ἀναγκάζει τὸ ἅγιον Πνεῦμα τὸν Ἰωάννην παραιτούμενον εὐαγγελίσασθαι δι' εὐλάβειαν καὶ ταπεινοφροσύνην ἐπὶ τῇ γηραλέᾳ αὐτοῦ ἡλικίᾳ, μετὰ ἔτη ἐνενήκοντα τῆς ἑαυτοῦ ζωῆς, μετὰ τὴν αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τῆς Πάτμου ἐπάνοδον, τὴν ἐπὶ Κλαυδίου γενομένην Καίσαρος. Καὶ μετὰ ἱκανὰ ἔτη τοῦ διατρίψαι αὐτὸν ἀπὸ τῆς Ἀσίας ἀναγκάζεται (by the bishops? or by the Holy Spirit?) ἐκθέσθαι τὸ Εὐαγγέλιον. Again, in 51. 33, the time of the Apostles, John, and the rest, is said to have been ninety-three years after our Lord's conception (we must read σύλληψιν for ἀνάληψιν). I have shown in *J. T. S.*, July, 1907, p. 603, that Hippolytus (who used Tertullian's list of emperors, which omitted Claudius in his proper place) must have inserted Claudius next after Domitian. According to Tertullian's absurd chronology the death of Domitian would be eighty years after the conception or birth of Christ, and the ninety-third year would be presumably the thirteenth year of Claudius. I suggested (l.c.) that this was the year of the Apocalypse; but I now think it evident that I was mistaken, and that the end of the Apostolic age, that is, the death of John, is intended. Epiphanius seems to presume it known that the Apocalypse was written under Domitian, who had exiled the Apostle, and that the latter returned after the tyrant's death. If I am right in suggesting that Victorinus used Hippolytus, then Hippolytus may have spoken explicitly on the subject. But I leave this merely as a suggestion. For Hegesippus seems to be the earliest explicit authority for St. John's banishment to Patmos, if Dr. Lawlor's argument in *J. T. S.* for April, 1907, is right (*Hegesippus and the Apocalypse*, pp. 436–43), as I am at present inclined to think. So Hegesippus might be either the ultimate or the immediate source of Victorinus.

conjecture of St. Dionysius. He is delighted to find a passage in Papias which might be so interpreted as to make two Johns, and thus to substantiate Dionysius's report as to the two tombs.

All this is weak enough, in all conscience. But Eusebius was unable to bring any corroborative evidence out of Papias or out of any other writer whatsoever. He declares the Gospel and first Epistle to be universally accepted, and he is our guarantee of the unanimity of antiquity against his own theory of the Apocalypse and the two Johns.¹

¹ Later writers who used Papias are Andrew of Caesarea and Maximus Confessor. The former refers to Papias, together with Irenaeus, Methodius, and Hippolytus, as early witnesses to the inspired character of the Apocalypse (*Comm. in Apoc.*, Praefatio, *P. G.*, vol. 106). Papias was used in the lost works of Apollinarius of Laodicea (or was it Apollinarius of Hierapolis?), possibly also by Anastasius of Mount Sinai, but the latter perhaps cites him at second hand.

Apostle, Disciple, Presbyter.

The habit of saying 'John, the disciple of the Lord' seems to have come to Irenaeus from Papias. Why should Papias have transmitted to St. Irenaeus this avoidance of the expression, 'John, the Apostle'?

The first answer which occurs to us is that in no extant fragment of Papias does the word Apostle occur. Andrew and Peter, Philip, Thomas and James, John and Matthew, are enumerated as 'disciples of the Lord'. I know of no passage cited indirectly from Papias where the word occurs, except where Eusebius says that 'Philip the Apostle' lived at Hierapolis (iii. 39. 9). In the Muratorian fragment we have 'Ioannes ex discipulis'. Of course this does not prove that Papias never used the word 'Apostle', but it suggests that he did not use it freely.¹ Now this is very interesting. The word *ἀπόστολος* is a distinctively Pauline word. It occurs thirty-four times in St. Paul, and once in Hebrews. St. Paul's disciple Luke uses it six times in his Gospel, and about twenty-nine times in Acts—in all seventy times in these Pauline documents. In three places of the Apocalypse it occurs under (I believe) Pauline influence, for the

¹ For he describes a list of Apostles as 'disciples of the Lord'. This does not prove any positive avoidance of the word Apostle, for it is the testimony of the Apostles which is in question, and their discipleship proves them to have been eyewitnesses, and apostleship could only add greater familiarity to this. We must merely conclude that 'disciple' is the more familiar word to Papias.

vocabulary of that book is curiously Pauline. Besides, it is found in the greeting of 1 and 2 Peter and in Jude 17, and also in 2 Peter iii. 2. Here, again, there might be imitation of St. Paul. In St. Matthew the word occurs once (x. 2), and in St. Mark once. In St. John's Gospel and Epistles never (except once in the Gospel, xiii. 16, in a different sense).

These are somewhat startling figures. Further, St. Matthew has *οἱ δώδεκα* or *οἱ ἑνδεκα* four times, and *οἱ δώδεκα* (or *ἑνδεκα*) *μαθηταί* three or four times; St. Mark has *οἱ δώδεκα* or *ἑνδεκα* ten times, St. Luke eight times, St. John four times, Acts twice, St. Paul once. It is evident to any student of the Gospels that *οἱ μαθηταί* very commonly simply means 'the Apostles', though not necessarily all the Apostles or only the Apostles. We are consequently prepared to find the word *μαθητής* less often in St. Luke, since he freely uses the word Apostle, and most often in St. John, who never uses Apostle, and seldom 'the twelve'. The figures are roughly:

Mt. 75, Mc. 45, Lc. 38, Jo. 81, Acts 30.

The result will be clearer if we remember that St. Matthew and St. Luke are about the same length, while St. Mark is .6 and St. John .77 of their measure. Reducing all to a common length we should get the figures:

Mt. 75, Mc. 75, Lc. 38, Jo. 105.

In the whole of the rest of the New Testament the word *μαθητής* never occurs at all. It may be accident that it is not in the Catholic Epistles and Apocalypse. But that it never occurs in St. Paul's writings, which fill more than one third of the New Testament, proves

that the use of the word was as unfamiliar to him as it was familiar to St. John.

It is evident that the habitual use of the word *μαθητής* belongs to the original oral or written source of the Synoptists. *Ἀπόστολος* apparently does not, though St. Luke assures us that the word was given to the twelve by our Lord himself (vi. 13). But our Lord used an Aramaic word, which was at first rendered *μαθητής*. The translation *ἀπόστολος* became usual only later, and it seems to have been St. Paul who gave it currency. (May we conjecture that it came into habitual use at Antioch, and thus into St. Paul's Christian vocabulary? ¹) The fourth Gospel thus reflects an older usage than St. Paul's and St. Luke's. This is easy to understand, if the author is one of the Twelve, and his recollections, when writing in his old age, are carrying him back to days when men spoke of 'the disciples', not of 'the Apostles'. ²

Papias lived in Hierapolis, close to the Pauline Churches of Colossae and Laodicea. Had he written in the first century, *c.* 50-70, we should have found him

¹ I need hardly point out that as *μαθητής* covers more than the twelve, so does 'Apostle',—e.g. Barnabas and Andronicus and Junias. But there seems no reason to suppose that *ἀπόστολος* could be used, any more than *μαθητής τοῦ Κυρίου*, of one who had not seen and heard the Lord. I can quite believe that Polycarp and Irenaeus might speak of John, the son of Zebedee, and Aristion together as 'Apostles'.

² I gave parallel instances of earlier usage in Mt. and Mk. in *The Brethren of the Lord* (J. T. S., April, 1906, p. 423): Thaddaeus (to distinguish from Judas Iscariot) in Mt., Mk. = Jude (after Iscariot's death) in Lk., Acts, Jo., Jude; and James in Mt., Mk. always with some mark of identification, in Lk., Acts, Paul (James, the son of Zebedee, being dead) no identification is usually given, since only one James (the 'little', the Lord's brother) was left. (I showed in that article that to deny that James, the Lord's brother, was an Apostle is to contradict all the original evidence we have.)

using the word Apostle, and not disciple. But he is a disciple of the later head of the Asian Churches, of St. John, not of St. Paul. He calls Peter and Andrew and the rest 'the Lord's disciples', as St. John would have done, as St. Paul would never have done, as St. Luke would only have done when citing an earlier authority. Papias belonged to the 'Johannine circle'; he uses the Johannine word 'disciple', and uses it of the twelve.

He also uses it of John and Aristion, and he has handed on to Irenaeus the expression, 'John, the Lord's disciple,' though Irenaeus habitually speaks of 'Apostles' when he means the twelve or is referring to other Apostles. It is clear that 'the Lord's disciples' used of John and Aristion by Papias cannot be considered an expression distinguishing them from Apostles, it rather unites them in a common group with the Apostles.

2. There is a further reason to be given for the title 'John, the disciple of the Lord', and a reason which accounts for the use of 'Presbyter' also: Papias would naturally give to his teacher the title which his teacher habitually used.

Now assuming that 'John, the Presbyter, the Lord's disciple', is the author of the fourth Gospel, we notice that this Gospel never uses the word Apostle nor (consequently) applies it to the author. The author declares himself to be an eyewitness, and insists on the certainty of his own testimony, but he never says he was one of the twelve (though he incidentally implies it by saying that he was at the Last Supper, where only the twelve were present, as I shall show further on). His description of himself (he will give no name) is 'the *disciple*

whom Jesus loved' (four times), 'who leaned on his breast', 'that *disciple*', 'that other *disciple*'—over and over again. And therefore Papias calls him 'the disciple of the Lord'.¹

Similarly in his two private letters he styles himself, not the 'Apostle of Jesus Christ' (as St. Paul and St. Peter do), but simply 'the Presbyter', as a title which all must recognise as distinctive. Consequently Papias, his disciple, gives him this title, the title by which all knew him—John the Presbyter.

Thus Papias gives to his Master John the names by which John described himself in his Gospel and in his shorter Epistles²—the disciple of the Lord, the Presbyter.

¹ This description of himself as 'disciple' has actually been used, in the habitually careless way of so-called critics, to show that he was not an Apostle. They were too ignorant to know that the word 'Apostle' is not used in the whole book. They should have inferred similarly from 'that other disciple' (xx. 2, 3, 4, 8) that Peter was not an Apostle!

² I need hardly say that in the first Epistle he does not name himself at all, and that in the preface to his Epistles to the seven Churches the writer is simply John, as if there were no other John.

Philip the Apostle at Hierapolis.

Two principal objections have been urged against the veracity of 'the Presbyters', or of Papias, or of the Asiatic tradition in general. The one is the witness of the Presbyters that our Lord lived till the age of fifty, and this I have elsewhere explained to be in all probability a mistake of Irenaeus, who has misinterpreted Papias (*Papias on the age of our Lord*, *J. T. S.*, Oct., 1907). The other objection is the confusion between Philip the Apostle and Philip the evangelist, one of the seven, both of whom are stated by different authorities to have died at Hierapolis, the town of Papias.

Eusebius, at all events, has confused the two in iii. 31, for there he quotes first Polycrates as speaking of Philip, 'one of the twelve Apostles,' next Gaius as speaking of Philip who had four daughters, prophetesses, and then proceeds to substantiate both these citations by Acts xxi. 8-9, where Philip the evangelist and his four daughters, prophetesses, are mentioned. Eusebius is not the only ancient writer who has failed to make the distinction. Which Philip died at Hierapolis? Harnack and Zahn agree (for once) that the evangelist is meant. Lightfoot is in favour of the Apostle,¹ and he is certainly right. But it is worth while to set out the conclusive arguments once more in a slightly different form.

¹ Harnack, *Chronol.* i. 669; Zahn, *Forschungen*, vi. 158-75; Lightfoot, *Colossians*, p. 45, *note*.

The matter is perfectly simple. We have two plain witnesses from Asia for the Apostle, and one witness (not from Asia), who convicts himself in two points of error, for the deacon.

1. Eusebius, in his account of Papias, tells us : *Τὸ μὲν οὖν κατὰ τὴν Ἱεράπολιν Φίλιππον τὸν ἀπόστολον ἅμα ταῖς θυγατράσιν διατρίψαι διὰ τῶν πρόσθεν δεδήλωται· ὡς δὲ κατὰ τοὺς αὐτοὺς ὁ Παπίας γενόμενος, διήγησιν παρεληφέναι θαυμασίαν ὑπὸ τῶν τοῦ Φιλίππου θυγατέρων μνημονεύει κτλ.* (iii. 39. 9).¹ We should naturally gather from this that Papias spoke of Philip as the Apostle. The text of Eusebius is certain enough, though Zahn points out that the Syriac version omits the word 'Apostle', and

¹ The words of De Boor's fragment are declared by E. Schwartz to be independent of Eusebius : *Παπίας δὲ ὁ εἰρημένος ιστόρησεν ὡς παραλαβὼν ἀπὸ τῶν θυγατέρων Φιλίππου κτλ.* I shall show, p. 95, that the excerptor (Philip of Side) has regularly used and misunderstood Eusebius, though he has also got hold of some other citations from Papias. In this sentence 'the mother of Manaïmos' is added to Eusebius, whether from Papias in reality must be doubtful. If this is the Manaën of Acts xiii. 1 he was 'foster-brother' of Herod. Schwartz (*Ueber den Tod der Söhne Zebedaei*, 1904, p. 15) urges that if Philip's daughters remembered the resurrection of Manaën's mother, they could not have lived until Papias's time. This is absurd. This raising of the dead is supposed to be anyhow after the Ascension of Christ, therefore not earlier than A.D. 29, probably many years later. But aged women who could remember even the year 29 (as children) could easily be known to Papias, c. 90-100. Further, it is neither certain nor probable that the daughters of Philip were eyewitnesses of the miracle. Lastly, it is almost inconceivable that the Manaïmos of De Boor's fragment should be the foster-brother of Herod, for the latter was born (I imagine) about 30 B.C., and the mother of Manaën would have been very old in Apostolic times. But 'Manaïmos' may have been the grandson of Herod's foster-brother. Schwartz's reasoning is habitually arbitrary and over-ingenious. 'He exemplifies copiously,' says Dr. Sanday, 'most of the procedure specially deprecated in these lectures.' *Crit. of the Fourth Gospel*, p. 32.

Rufinus has corrected it to 'evangelist': these Syriac and Latin paraphrases are of little authority, and the Greek MSS. are excellent. But it must be admitted that it is possible that Eusebius supplied the word, although it is most improbable that Papias should not have given some title to Philip. It is possible that Papias said merely 'the disciple of the Lord'.

2. But we have further evidence as to what Papias thought of Philip, and Papias (at least) cannot have had any confusion of mind on the subject of the identity of the latter. In the prologue, about which we have said so much, Papias gave a list of the disciples of the Lord whose sayings he could report at third hand: 'Andrew or Peter, or Philip, or Thomas or James, or John or Matthew, or any other.' Now the Philip who is named is clearly, from his position in the list, an Apostle. The order is plain:

(a) Andrew and Peter, two brothers, unavoidably the first pair.

(b) Philip, alone; then Thomas, who is also coupled with him in Acts i. 13, and James of Jerusalem.

(c) John, whom we should have expected next after Andrew and Peter.

(d) Matthew the evangelist, whose name is suggested by that of John the evangelist.

The Philip mentioned here among Apostles next after Andrew (as in St. Mark's list, iii. 18) is clearly Philip the Apostle, the friend of Andrew.¹ It is natural to suppose that he has so early a position in Papias's list, even

¹ Philip is mentioned with 'Andrew and Peter' (in this unusual order) in John i. 42. He was of their village (i. 45). He was probably standing beside Andrew in the scene vi. 5-8. He was addressed together with Andrew by the Greeks in xii. 22, and went with him to give their message to Christ.

before James of Jerusalem and John of Ephesus, because he was the nearest to Papias, who had second hand traditions of him through his daughter at Hierapolis as well as the third hand traditions (about an earlier date than Philip's sojourn at Hierapolis) that he mentions here.

3. Now the fourth Gospel, whether by John the Apostle or not, was certainly written in Asia, and it shows a particular interest in Philip the Apostle: it records his call by Christ and that of Nathanael by him, and it gives some quite unimportant remarks made by him on two occasions; the repeated mention of Nathanael, who is otherwise unknown, seems to be due to his being the friend of Philip. One other apostle receives special mention in the fourth Gospel: it is Thomas, whom Papias and St. Luke both couple with Philip.

Hence we have strong reasons for believing that Philip of Hierapolis was really Philip of Bethsaida, as Papias appears to have declared.

4. We have another important witness, Polycrates of Ephesus, whose words are twice quoted by Eusebius (iii. 31. 3 and v. 24. 2):

Καὶ γὰρ κατὰ τὴν Ἀσίαν μεγάλα στοιχεῖα κεκοίμηνται ἅτινα ἀναστήσεται τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῆς παρουσίας τοῦ Κυρίου, ἐν ᾗ ἔρχεται μετὰ δόξης ἐξ οὐρανῶν καὶ ἀναζητήσκει πάντας τοὺς ἁγίους, Φίλιππον τῶν δώδεκα ἀποστόλων, ὃς κεκοίμηνται ἐν Ἱεραπόλει, καὶ δύο θυγατέρες αὐτοῦ γεγηρακυῖαι παρθένοι, καὶ ἡ ἑτέρα αὐτοῦ θυγάτηρ ἐν ἁγίῳ πνεύματι πολιτευσαμένη ἐν Ἐφέσῳ ἀναπαύεται, ἔτι δὲ καὶ Ἰωάννης, κτλ.

Here, again, we have a definite statement that Philip was one of the twelve. Lightfoot strangely finds three daughters mentioned, wrongly supplying *κεκοίμηνται ἐν Ἱεραπόλει* after *θυγατέρες*.¹ But *ἡ ἑτέρα* means 'one of the

¹ This is in itself a possible construction, but here it is impossible, for *ἡ ἑτέρα* can only mean 'one of the two', and if both slept in

two', and cannot possibly mean anything else: 'Philip, of the twelve Apostles, who sleeps in Hierapolis, and two daughters of his who lived in virginity till old age, and one of these two daughters, after conversation in the Holy Ghost, sleeps in Ephesus', the city of Polycrates. He does not state where the other was buried, but he assumes that we shall gather that it was in Hierapolis with her father.

So far not a word to the effect that the daughters were prophetesses. If any one was likely to know that they were prophetesses it was Papias, but we do not hear

Hierapolis, one of them cannot have rested at Ephesus. The nominative *θυγατέρες* is in reality simply in a line with *Ἰωάννης . . . Πολύκαρπος . . . Θρασέας*, all being in apposition with *μεγάλα στοιχία*. The construction is interrupted by the odd accusative *Φίλιππον*, which is due to attraction from the neighbouring verb *ἀναζητήσει*. It is difficult to imagine that Polycrates really wrote *Φίλιππον* instead of the obvious *Φίλιππος*, though the Greek MSS. are unanimous in both places of Eusebius, and are supported by Jerome (*De Viris ill.* 45), and also by Rufinus since he understands that there were three daughters. But surely it was a mistake by a scribe in the copy of Papias used by Eusebius, as the existing anacoluthon is unnecessary and unnatural. Dr. Gwatkin, *Early Church Hist.* i, p. 108 (1909), follows Lightfoot: 'Thither came Philip of Bethsaida with his three daughters.' Zahn also makes out three (l. c. p. 170), and translates *ἡ ἑτέρα* as 'die andere', i. e. 'the third', 'so folgt dass es in Asien eine vierte überhaupt nicht gegeben hat.' This is most extraordinary. When did *ἕτερος* mean a third? If Polycrates meant 'one of the two', pray what other expression had he in Greek to use except *ἡ ἑτέρα*? Perhaps he might have said *μία*, as we have *unus ex duobus*, *εἰς ἐκ τῶν δύο*, in St. John i. 40; but will any one pretend that this is such good Latin and Greek as *alter ex duobus* and *ὁ ἕτερος ἐκ τῶν δυοῖν*? Or will Dr. Zahn take refuge in the fact that there is no *ἐξ αὐτῶν* (or *ἐξ αὐτῶν*, which Papias would hardly use)? But we do not need to add 'of them' when we say 'the one' in English, nor is it wanted in Greek. I am ashamed of arguing so obvious a point at such length; but Lightfoot is so nearly infallible, and Zahn is about the most learned man alive, and I cannot question their accuracy without justifying myself.

that he said so. By ἐν ἁγίῳ πνεύματι πολιτευσαμένη Polycrates means that the lady who lived in his own city was not merely a witness to her father's views but was herself a holy and venerable personage.

5. There is another witness, Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* iii. 52, 53 and ap. Euseb. *H. E.* iii. 30. 1): 'Will they find fault with the Apostles? For Peter and Philip had children, and Philip gave his daughters to husbands.' This contradicts both Acts as to Philip the deacon, and Polycrates as to the Apostle, unless other daughters of the Apostle are meant than those mentioned by Polycrates. Clement is, as usual, following some apocryphal source. Yet at least his source made Philip the Apostle a father of daughters. It is surely quite possible for two men of the name of Philip to have had daughters. Even at the present day I have known of more than one man of the name who had daughters, and I have not felt obliged to identify them.

We have one adverse witness, Gaius in his dialogue against the Montanist Proclus: Μετὰ τοῦτον προφήτιδες τέσσαρες αἱ Φιλίππου γεγέννηνται ἐν Ἱεραπόλει τῇ κατὰ τὴν Ἀσίαν· ὁ τάφος αὐτῶν ἐστὶν ἐκεῖ καὶ ὁ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτῶν. Gaius was not an Asiatic, but apparently a Roman; his witness is thereby of little value, and we are not surprised to find him mistaken on two points. According to Polycrates Philip had but two daughters with him in Asia, and one of these was buried at Ephesus. Gaius follows Acts xxi. 9 in giving four daughters, and he states that all four were buried at Hierapolis. Since in these two points he is at fault, we may be sure that he is wrong in the assumption which underlies his mistake, and that he had no right to identify Philip of Hierapolis

with the Evangelist of Acts xxi and to style his daughters prophetesses.

Now we know that Montanists like Proclus justified their female prophetesses by appealing to the example of the four daughters of Philip spoken of in Acts xxi; we learn this from a fragment of Origen on 1 Cor. xiv. 36 (Cramer, v, p. 279) *Τέσσαρες, φασιν, θυγατέρες ἦσαν Φιλίππου τοῦ εὐαγγελιστοῦ, καὶ ἐπροφήτεον· εἰ δὲ ἐπροφήτεον, τί ἄτοπόν ἐστι καὶ τὰς ἡμετέρας, ὥς φασιν ἐκείνοι, προφήτιδας προφητεύειν*; and similarly the Anti-Montanist (wrote 192) in Eusebius (v. 17. 3) appeals against the Montanists to Agabus, Judas, Silas, the daughters of Philip (all these are in Acts), Ammia of Philadelphia, and Quadratus.¹ The last-named was perhaps the same as the bishop of Athens mentioned by Dionysius of Corinth (Eus. iv. 23. 3), but Eusebius mentions him in iii. 37. 1 after speaking of Ignatius and Heros: *τῶν δὲ κατὰ τούτους διαλαμψάντων καὶ Κοδρᾶτος ἦν, ὃν ἅμα ταῖς Φιλίππου θυγατράσιν προφητικῶ χαρίσματι λόγος ἔχει διαπρέψαι*. Evidently Eusebius knows nothing more about him,² and this much is an unjustified inference from the words of the Anti-Montanist. Now the latter mentions the daughters of Philip, prophetesses, together with the other prophets mentioned in Acts—the list is a complete one, whereas Ammia and Quadratus are additions; but there is nothing at all to suggest that the Anti-Montanist

¹ Similarly St. Jerome (*Ep.* 41. 2) appeals to St. Peter against the Montanists, and supposes them to appeal to the four daughters of Philip and to Agabus. We find the same in St. Epiphanius *Haer.* 48. 8 (Peter and Agabus) and 49. 3 (the four daughters of Philip). But there is no suggestion that anything was known of the daughters of Philip beyond what is said in Acts.

² He possessed a copy of his *Apology* presented to Hadrian. This gave his date (iv. 3. 1).

regarded them as having lived at Hierapolis, or that he knew anything of them beyond what he found in Acts xxi.

Another passage of Gaius has to be cited: *Ἐγὼ δὲ τὰ τρόπαια τῶν ἀποστόλων ἔχω δεῖξαι. Ἐὰν γὰρ θελήσης ἀπελθεῖν ἐπὶ τὸν Βασικανὸν ἢ ἐπὶ τὴν ὁδὸν τὴν Ὀστίαν, εὐρήσεις τὰ τρόπαια τῶν ταύτην ἰδρυσαμένων τὴν ἐκκλησίαν* (Eus. ii. 25. 7). Here he is obviously replying to the Asiatics who pointed to the tombs of Philip and John and the rest. Very likely it was the letter of Polycrates that was put forward as a plea by the Montanists; if not, it was an imitation of it, for we are dealing with a time possibly five or ten years later than the letter of Polycrates. Now it is clear that Gaius found the Asiatics appealing to the tombs of Philip and his two daughters, amongst other tombs, to show the weight of their traditions, and he also found them appealing to the four prophetesses, daughters of another Philip, mentioned in Acts, to show that it was not improper for women like Priscilla and Maximilla to prophesy. Gaius has understood the same daughters of the same Philip to have been intended in the two quite separate appeals. Hence his incorrect statement that four daughters of Philip the evangelist were buried at Hierapolis, when in reality one daughter of Philip the Apostle was buried there, and she not a prophetess at all.

It seems to me that the mistake of Gaius is evident and completely accounted for, while the contrary evidence of Papias and Polycrates is definite and unimpeachable. There is no ground whatever for supposing any uncertainty in Asiatic tradition about the daughters of Philip. A Roman writer *c.* 200-10 made a blunder, that is all.

*Consequences of assuming the separate existence
of John the Presbyter.*

To my own mind the foregoing arguments are quite conclusive against the existence of the Presbyter John as a distinct personality. But another argument may yet be added; it is the *reductio ad absurdum* of the hypothesis of two Johns.

A. If the two Johns were both in Asia, as Eusebius, Lightfoot, Westcott, and many others have assumed, and if the Gospel was written by the Apostle, as they held, then we reach the astounding result that 'the Presbyter' of 2 and 3 John (who is certainly the same person as the writer of the Gospel) is not John the Presbyter, but John the Apostle. For it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the three epistles are by the same writer (or, let us admit for argument's sake, that they claim to be by the same writer), and no sane critic will deny that the Gospel and the first Epistle are from the same pen.

B. Hence it becomes imperative¹ to reverse the hypothesis, and make the Presbyter the author of 2 and 3 John, and consequently of the first Epistle and

¹ Of course Lightfoot and Westcott did not think it imperative. But surely this was an illusion. I think this explains why their authority on this question has not been greater: they reached a half-solution, and it has never been accepted as satisfactory.

of the Gospel. This is the view of Hugo Delff and it was supported by Dr. Sanday in 1905. But this hypothesis must be ruled out of court, for the author of the Gospel claims to be one of the twelve, since he shows that he was present at the Last Supper, and he asks, as if one of the twelve, who was to be the traitor :

Matt. xxvi. 20: 'He sat down with his twelve disciples, and whilst they were eating he said: "Amen, I say to you, that one of you is about to betray me."' Mark xiv. 17: 'He cometh with the twelve. And when they were at table and eating, Jesus saith: "Amen, I say to you, one of you that eateth with me shall betray me."' Luke xxii. 14: 'He sat down and the twelve Apostles with him' (*note how Luke introduces the word 'Apostles'*). v. 21: 'The hand of him that betrayeth me is with me on the table.' *St. John presupposes these accounts (at least those of Luke and Mark), for he begins abruptly, xiii. 2, 'and when supper was ended,' though he had mentioned no supper. In v. 23 we have: 'Now there was leaning on Jesus's bosom one of his disciples' (this is probably equivalent in itself to 'one of his Apostles', as the latter word is not in the vocabulary of this Gospel), 'whom Jesus loved. Simon Peter therefore beckoned to him, and said to him: "Who is it of whom he speaketh?" He therefore that leaned on the breast of Jesus saith to him: "Lord, who is it?"'*

He was not a mere boy who did not count, for he took charge of the Mother of Jesus. He is not (as often) correcting the Synoptists. He means himself to be conceived of as one of the twelve. If he was not really an Apostle, he certainly has done his best to imply that he was one, and a particularly prominent one.

C. Hence the more attractive and ingenious hypothesis put forward very tentatively by Harnack in 1897 (*Chronol. i, p. 659 seq.*): I have no ground for supposing that he holds it still in 1910, but it is worth discussing.

According to this view John the Presbyter was not a disciple of the Lord, but he was the transmitter of the traditions of John the Apostle,¹ to whom he refers in the Gospel as the 'beloved disciple'. He only once speaks in the first person (xxi. 24: 'We know that his testimony is true'), and then in the name of the Presbyters of Asia testifying to the Gospel as the true

¹ *Chronol.* i. 678: 'Der vorgetragene Versuch hat sich mir bisher am meisten bewährt. Die Frage, ob der Zebedaäde Johannes wirklich einmal nach Asien gekommen ist, lässt er offen; er kann dahin gekommen sein, wie andere Apostel auch einmal Asien berührt haben; aber er ist nicht *der Apostel* und "Oberbischof" Asiens gewesen. Das war vielmehr der Presbyter Johannes, ein Palästinenser, ein hellenistisch gebildeter Jude und im weiteren Sinne ein Herrnjünger. Er hat lange Zeit, bis zu den Tagen Trajans, in Ephesus gelebt; er hat gegen Ende der Regierung Domitians die Apokalypse herausgegeben und in dem Menschenalter zwischen c. 80 und c. 110 das Evangelium und die Briefe geschrieben, jenes wahrscheinlich zunächst für einen kleinen Kreis nahestehender Schüler und unter Anlehnung an Überlieferungen, die er von dem Apostel Johannes erhalten hatte, der als Jünger, den der Herr lieb hatte, ihm im Vordergrund der Jünger stand, und von dem er auch mündlich erzählt hat.' Or, to argue this in English, the author of the Epistles is naturally identified with the overseer of all Asia whom we find in the Apocalypse. John the Presbyter was consequently a very important person. He wrote letters to the seven Churches of Asia, besides three epistles reckoned as canonical. He was exiled by Domitian to Patmos. After his return he founded more bishoprics, and was the hero of the beautiful story of the robber in the *Quis dives salvetur* of Clement. There will be nothing in ancient legend which can certainly be put down to the Apostle. It will be the Presbyter who lived until the time of Trajan, as St. Irenaeus twice tells us of the Apostle (ap. Eus. *H. E.* iii. 23). The touching story related by St. Jerome, on ancient but unknown authority, in his commentary on Galatians, how in his old age the Apostle John could give no other instruction but 'Little children, love one another', will belong to the Presbyter. He will be incontestably the most interesting personage, next to St. Paul, of the first age of Christianity, if Harnack is right.

witness of John the son of Zebedee. The Gospel is therefore, in Harnack's words: 'an εὐαγγέλιον Ἰωάννου (τοῦ πρεσβυτέρου) κατὰ Ἰωάννην (τὸν Ζεβεδαίου)' (p. 677). The Apostle has been expelled with a pitchfork, *tamen usque recurret!* 'Der Evangelist, d. h. der Presbyter und "Herrnjünger" Johannes sich in seinem Buche auf den Zebedaïden Johannes in besonderer Weise bezogen hat'. But this explanation of xxi. 24 Οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ μαθητὴς ὁ μαρτυρῶν περὶ τούτων καὶ γράψας ταῦτα (or should we read ὁ καὶ μαρτυρῶν περὶ τούτων ὁ καὶ γράψας ταῦτα ?) is impossible, for the passage states that the disciple mentioned (whom Harnack admits to be the son of Zebedee) not only witnessed but also wrote.¹

Further, this Presbyter John was, in Harnack's view, not a disciple of the Lord—this is to be thought certain—yet he is the author of 1 John i. 1, 2: 'That which was from the beginning, which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked upon, and our hands have handled, of the Word of Life: for the Life was manifested: and we have seen, and do bear witness, and declare unto you the Life eternal, which was with the Father, and hath appeared to us: that which we have seen and have heard, we declare unto you, that you also may have fellowship with us,' &c.

The reiteration, the emphasis of this passage leave nothing to be desired. Either the writer was a disciple

¹ Dr. Sanday says: 'This, according to Harnack, only convicts them of a deliberate untruth, contradicted by the verses immediately preceding. If we must needs accuse the unfortunate editors of falsification, we might at least give them credit for the sense to take care that their falsehood was not exposed by their own words, and almost (as it were) in the same breath.' *Criticism of the Fourth Gospel*, p. 63.

or he was a liar (with a strong adjective attached). What does Harnack say?

One must not forget that a Mystic is speaking, who on the one hand can write (John i. 18): Θεὸν οὐδεὶς ἑώρακεν πώποτε, and on the other hand (3 John 11): ὁ κακοποιῶν οὐχ ἑώρακεν τὸν Θεόν, and (1 John iii. 6): πᾶς ὁ ἁμαρτάνων οὐχ ἑώρακεν (Θεόν) οὐδὲ ἔγνωκεν αὐτόν. What kind of a hearing, seeing, looking upon, tasting it is that he means (compare i. 14), is seen by contrast with the story of Thomas (John xx. 29), which closes with the words: ὅτι ἑώρακάς με πεπίστευκας; μακάριοι οἱ μὴ ἰδόντες καὶ πιστεύσαντες. This passage proves that he cannot have intended an earthly seeing, &c., in John i. 1.¹

The proof seems rather weak! We are accustomed perhaps to such statements in German, though seldom from Harnack. But in English or French they are rather painful. I will not suppose that Harnack still holds to his theory.

D. Consequently it is quite certain that the writer of 1 John (unless a forger) was a 'disciple of the Lord'.

¹ I suppose I must answer what needs no answer: In John i. 18 it is denied that any one can see God *as He is* (the beatific vision), whereas in 3 John 11 the writer speaks of a mystical friendship with God by contemplation such as holy souls can attain in this life; the distinction is obvious enough, for the first passage simply repeats the Old Testament view, while the others mean ἑώρακεν in the sense of 'know' (as John xiv. 9, where οὐκ ἔγνωκάς με; is followed by ὁ ἑωρακὼς ἐμὲ ἑώρακεν τὸν πατέρα), the spiritual knowledge of God obtained by knowing Jesus Christ. Again, in John xx. 29 faith in the Resurrection without sight is praised, as being a more perfect faith; but it is not said that having known of Christ in the flesh is not a great advantage, nor is it in the least suggested that it is better not to have been a personal disciple! In 1 John i. 1 there is not a word about faith, and the writer is simply asseverating with all his might that he had been a personal disciple and that his witness is to be depended upon. If we say 'he cannot have intended an earthly seeing, &c.,' in this verse, we must say that he could not mean an earthly seeing in John xix. 34-5: 'and immediately there came forth blood and water, and he who saw it hath borne witness' (cp. 1 John v. 6-9).

This facilitates Harnack's identification of him with John the Presbyter, whom we have proved to have been a disciple of the Lord. But it spoils Harnack's theory altogether, for it makes the writer of the Epistle and Gospel relate the facts on his own authority, and not on that of the son of Zebedee, his master. This conclusion is corroborated, as we saw, by the claims put forward in John xxi. 24, as well as in xix. 35. Yet all Harnack's grounds for combining author of Epistles, Gospel, and Apocalypse with the Presbyter into one eminent personage who died at Ephesus at a late date, hold good. And we have to add to them that the author of the Gospel claimed to be an Apostle, though the word 'Apostle' is not in his vocabulary. What is still more important, all the authorities who witness to the dwelling of John the Presbyter in Asia witness to his being the Apostle. We have no right to accept a part of their witness and reject the rest. Consequently Harnack's view is bound to come round to the traditional one, if it is logically carried out.

E. But let us put aside all question of the authorship of any New Testament writings. Apart from this, is it possible to find a theory which admits of two Johns? First is the notion that there were two Johns in Asia, and even at Ephesus. This was the theory of Dionysius and Eusebius. We have already seen that it is not really supported by Papias, that it is excluded by the witness of Irenaeus and Polycrates, not to speak of the witness to Papias from Victorinus and others. Further, it is apt to involve us in the difficulty already explained under A. And Apoc. i. 4 implies one unique John in Asia.

F. Next is the now famous theory that there was but

one John at Ephesus, the Presbyter. The ground for this is the statement attributed to Papias by Philip of Side (in the De Boor fragment and in an interpolation in the best MS. of George Hamartolus) that John the Divine and James his brother were put to death by the Jews (see pp. 95 foll.). Now I do not wish here to attempt anything like a complete answer to this difficulty, but merely to make four points :

1. Papias cannot possibly have said this. It is common enough to find ancient writers quoted as saying what they never said. Irenaeus, Victorinus, Eusebius, and all the rest who knew the work of Papias directly or indirectly, are our witnesses¹: Irenaeus tells us John the Apostle lived on at Ephesus until the reign of Trajan; Victorinus tells us that he returned from Patmos after the death of Domitian; Clement and Origen say the same, though they give no name to 'the tyrant'. Eusebius says the ancients handed down that John returned to Ephesus under Nerva. The Leucian Acts made him go down alive into his grave.

2. The supposed confirmation of the martyrdom of St. John from the ancient feast of St. James and John and from the Syriac Martyrology and the Carthaginian Kalendar was too unmeaning to need refutation. Nevertheless it has been adequately dealt with by Dean Bernard (*Irish Church Quarterly*, Jan. 1908) and Dean Armitage Robinson (*Historical character of St. John's Gospel*, 1908, Appendix). They have shown that in the fourth century the feast was not taken to imply that John was a martyr to blood like James.

3. But the explanation that John had sufferings equi-

¹ So Harnack very strongly, *Chronol.* i, p. 666.

valent to martyrdom is found already in Origen, as the solution of the difficulty caused by our Lord's promise that he should drink His chalice. Polycrates seems to mean the same when he calls him *μάρτυς*. In 177 we find the Confessors of Lyons protesting that they ought not to be called martyrs until they were dead (Euseb. v. 2, 3), which shows that it was difficult for confessors to avoid the higher title (see Dr. Abbott on this subject in *Notes on N. T. Criticism*, 1907, § 2935 foll.). This leads us to my third point, viz. that the evidence of the prophecy 'You shall indeed be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with and drink the chalice that I shall drink of' (Mt. xx. 23, Mk. x. 39) cannot be quoted in favour of St. John's violent death, because the unbroken tradition of commentators explained it otherwise, yet found it a difficulty. Had St. John really died a martyr, the tradition of his martyrdom would have been certain to adhere to these texts.

4. Lastly, John xxi. 20-3 makes it impossible that the personage of verse 24 (who is the 'beloved disciple', the witness of the facts and the writer of them) should have died a violent death at an early date. He is represented as still living, and as expected to live on until the second coming. He is evidently at an advanced age. The Leucian Acts carried on this idea: John was buried, indeed, but not dead, and in St. Augustine's day he was popularly believed to be alive in his tomb at Ephesus. But the personage of John xxi. 24 claims (as we saw) to be the Apostle, and his name was John (as we shall see). The Leucian Acts are of John the Apostle. The tomb was of John the Apostle. So we have to encounter a most hideous tangle of improba-

bilities if we insist that the Apostle was 'killed by the Jews'.

G. Wellhausen's new study of the fourth Gospel supplies us with a new theory. His exegesis of xix. 25 is strange. 'His Mother and His Mother's sister, Mary of Cleophas and Mary Magdalen' are commonly understood to be three people, if not four. Wellhausen calmly assumes that there are only two. I translate his comment (*Das Evangelium Johannis*, 1908, p. 87):

Klopas cannot be the husband of the mother of Jesus, for his name was Joseph; it is equally impossible that he should be her father or some other blood-relation, for she could not be thus distinguished from her sister. On the other hand her sister also cannot be distinguished from her by her dwelling-place ('of Magdala'), and the same name for two sisters is surprising. In other words the proper names Mary of Klopas and Mary Magdalen are not a correct explanation of the appellatives which preceded, and are therefore probably interpolated. Whence the name of Klopas comes, and what it refers to as a genitive, one does not know.

The last confession of ignorance is to be admired. But the preceding conclusion is indeed wonderful. The reason alleged for it simply shows that the exegesis is absurd, not that anything has been interpolated. The eminent critic goes on:

It is presupposed that the mother of Jesus is a widow and that she has no other son.¹ The *Anonymus*, who is to take the place of a son to her, takes her away at once εἰς τὰ ἱδία. He has therefore his home in Jerusalem, and is consequently not a Galilaean and not the son of Zebedee.

¹ This is a sufficiently candid and unprejudiced reply to the theories of Mayor, Zahn, &c., that 'the brethren of the Lord' were sons of Joseph and Mary, for these critics are conservative, and accept St. John's historical statements.

But εἰς τὰ ἴδια may easily mean 'to his temporary home in Jerusalem', or 'to his home in Galilee, when he went thither'. Besides, tradition gives the son of Zebedee a home in Jerusalem, where Mary lived and died. Lastly, τὰ ἴδια does not express a permanent domicile at all: it identifies 'home' not with house, but with possessions, which might be lands or luggage, a camel or a tent!¹ The evangelist did not say 'to his own house' and he did not mean it. If Wellhausen had inferred that the beloved disciple had not a house of his own, he would have been less arbitrary than he actually is.

That Mary stayed in Jerusalem with a son who was recommended to her by Jesus will not be a pure invention, but must have some ground or other. This may be found in Acts xii. 12. According to this passage there was in Jerusalem a widow Mary, who lived with her son in a house which served the disciples as a meeting-place. *From a mother of the community she might become the mother of Jesus, and her real son might in consequence become her adoptive son.* In this case the *Anonymus* would not be the son of Zebedee, yet he would still be John, that is to say the John who bore the surname Mark and is identical with the second evangelist. Possibly it was already at an early date that the anonymous young man who alone remained with Jesus and was nearly arrested with him (Mark xiv. 51, 52) was recognized as the writer himself, John Mark, and raised to the rank of the beloved disciple. This

¹ In John xvi. 32 σκορπισθῆτε ἕκαστος εἰς τὰ ἴδια, and in Acts xxi. 6 ὑπέστρεψαν εἰς τὰ ἴδια, we may naturally supply the idea of a house. But in John i. 11 εἰς τὰ ἴδια ἦλθεν, the idea is not of house, but of home among οἱ ἴδιοι, and in Luke xviii. 28 ἀφέντες τὰ ἴδια (so B, D, &c.) ἠκολουθήσαμέν σοι, the root-meaning of 'possessions' is uppermost. Compare Lk. ii. 49 ἐν τοῖς τοῦ πατρός μου with John xiv. 2 ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ τοῦ πατρός μου, where the former speaks of a home to be busy in, the latter of a home to dwell in permanently (μοναί).

conjecture is the more probable in that the beloved disciple here appears alone beneath the cross, with the exception, of course, of the women.

This is all most characteristic of Wellhausen. I have italicized one delightful sentence. Altogether this labyrinth of mistakes attributed to the end of the first century is quite puzzling to think out. On John xxi. 20 Wellhausen says (p. 100):

Here by the *Anonymus* John the son of Zebedee is understood (otherwise than in xix. 25-6), and the Ephesine tradition about him is presupposed. But how on the ground of a false tradition could a *vaticinium ex eventu* arise, whose non-fulfilment causes anxiety? It would seem that means are wanting for the satisfactory solution of this riddle. With regard to this point we need no longer doubt that John of Zebedee followed his Master in death long before Peter, and that he was condemned together with his brother James at Jerusalem.

No evidence for this last statement is known, for the pseudo-Papian witness does not say that John suffered at Jerusalem, or with James. And the riddle is gratuitous as well as insoluble.

I do not propose to refute this elaborate tangle of supposed misunderstandings. I only remark that much of it depends on Wellhausen's impossible theory of the plural authorship of the fourth Gospel, which consists in his opinion of a *Grundschrift*, A, which was subjected to a series of revisions by various hands, B¹, B², &c. Now it is true that Wellhausen has shown a number of inconsequences in the Gospel, and especially a number of places where the sense is obscured by parenthetical remarks or perhaps by long interpolations. But I think such phenomena can be paralleled in the first Epistle. On the other hand it would be difficult

to find any book in which unity of style, of diction, of vocabulary is so marked as in the Gospel of St. John. It is simply impossible to dissect it into layers of JE and P; and the attempt made in so ingenious a manner diminishes our admiration for the wide common sense of the operator, at the very same time that it throws a real light on the manner in which the author of the Gospel himself wrote and rewrote, compiled, enlarged, added, interpolated, revised.

H. I have discussed enough combinations and hypotheses. They may be multiplied *ad infinitum*, but the elements out of which they are fashioned remain much the same. Lastly, there is the hypothesis that there was never any John of Ephesus at all. This does not seem to me to be a much more violent hypothesis than those I have already discussed. Indeed German Biblical critics are often sufficiently ignorant of Patristic literature in general, and of the second century in particular, to be capable of advancing such a view as tenable and reasonable. On the other side stands a tradition which I hope I have shown to be consistent and unbroken. If the critics do not bow to facts, so much the worse for the critics.

The witness of John the Presbyter to his own identity.

A. One definite witness to the Presbyter John's identity has come down to us, in his own words, preserved to us by Eusebius in the quotation from Papias about St. Mark. The character of the speaker and his position and his past history appear in the words he uses.

1. The Presbyter speaks with authority. He judges the Gospel of St. Mark as a superior, and as one having more perfect knowledge. The incorrectness of the order is stated as by one who himself remembered the facts. He is able to criticize not merely the writer of the Gospel, but his authority, the Apostle St. Peter. He quotes no disciple, no Apostle, to bear out his unhesitating declarations. His own word is enough.

2. The impression we gather is undoubtedly that this is not a 'Presbyter, disciple of the Apostles', but one who himself was a 'disciple of the Lord'. This is an important confirmation of our decision that the words of Papias τοῦ Κυρίου μαθηταί are genuine.

3. But cannot we go further? The tone of authority, the approving criticism of Peter, the patronizing defence of Mark, make us feel that we have to do with no ordinary disciple, but one who really remembered the chief

events related by St. Mark, and had been an actor in them, *quorum pars magna fuit*.

B. The Epistles have already given their witness: they are by one author; they are by an eyewitness (1 John i. 1 and v. 6-9); they are by 'the Presbyter'; they are by an overseer of Churches; they are by the author of the Gospel, to which 1 John is a kind of *envoi*.

C. The Gospel claims to be by an Apostle (as I have pointed out), an eyewitness, an especially beloved disciple. But neither the Gospel nor the Epistles claim to be written by any one with a name. The readers are supposed to be able to supply a name, for there is no pretence at anonymity; on the contrary, the writer asserts his personality very vigorously, and makes much of the acknowledged weight of his testimony.

This is surely a very important point. For in early times every one assumed that John was meant. To the ecclesiastical writers we can add the evidence of all the families of MSS. and of all the versions. The evidence is absolutely unbroken and unanimous, for the Alogi and Gaius evidently thought that the writings were forgeries which *claimed* to be by the Apostle John.

But Harnack has a curious suggestion to support his view that the Gospel was not written by John, but 'by another man of the same name', as the late Mr. C. L. Dodgson used to say of Homer: 'If a reverent scholar speaks here, whose name was also John, then all is clear' (*Chronol.*, p. 677, note). I can imagine no more confusing explanation. My name (as a monk) is also John, yet it has never struck me that I must consequently use a periphrasis when I speak of my patron

saint. Similarly I feel no awkwardness in mentioning Chapman's Homer.

On the other hand, the ordinary explanation that the author avoids mentioning his own name is at once obvious and inevitable. If the author was not the Apostle, he was not a reverent disciple, shy of writing his master's name because it was his own, but he was simply a forger, who intended to be taken for the Apostle. Dr. Salmon wrote long ago¹:

It is plain from the work itself that whoever composed it intended it to be received as emanating from the beloved disciple, and we cannot doubt that it was as such it was received by those who did accept it. Let me call your attention to the singular fact, that the name of the Apostle John is never mentioned in St. John's Gospel. If you had only that Gospel, you would never know that there was an Apostle of the name. The other Gospels, when they speak of the forerunner of our Lord, always give him the title of the Baptist, so as to prevent confusion between the two Johns. This Gospel speaks of him simply as John, so that a reader not otherwise informed would never have it suggested to him that there was another of the name. . . . No one disputes that, if the writer were not the Apostle John, he was some one who wished to pass for him. But a forger would be likely to have made some more distinct mention of the person who played the principal part of his scheme; and he certainly could scarcely have hit on such a note of genuineness as that, whereas almost every one in the Church had felt the necessity of distinguishing by some special name John the forerunner from John the Apostle, there was one person who would feel no such necessity, and who would not form this habit—namely the Apostle himself.—*Introd. to the N. T.*, 3rd ed., p. 62.

I cannot see any escape from this reasoning.² I hold

¹ His argument was used much earlier by Credner. See also Lightfoot, *Essays on Supernat. Rel.*, p. 19.

² As a type of the confidence with which paradox is advanced in Germany, in sublime unconsciousness that it is paradox, I cite

it to be entirely certain that the Gospel claims to be by John, the beloved disciple, one of the Apostles, who survived at Ephesus for so long a period that it was thought he would not die at all (xxi. 23). That the claim should be a false one is excluded by the vast amount of external evidence, only a part of which has been referred to above, as well as by Dr. Salmon's reasoning.¹

D. The Apocalypse is shown by its matter to proceed from the same school as the Gospel. The writer calls himself John. He is the superior of the Asiatic Churches. He assumes that those Churches know no other John. Consequently we must—entirely apart from all the external evidence against two Asiatic Johns—be inclined to identify him with the John of Ephesus who survived so long.

a few words from the translation of Jülicher's book, published under the patronage of a popular novelist: 'It is, in fact, the one unassailable proposition which criticism, dealing solely with the internal evidence, can set up concerning the Fourth Gospel, that its author was not "the disciple whom Jesus loved"'.—*Introd. to the N. T.*, p. 415.

¹ To this invincible argument a word must be added in view of the contention that John the son of Zebedee may have died at an early date, so that the only two Johns of importance to the readers of the Gospel were the Baptist and the Presbyter. To the readers, —yes. But to the Presbyter, throwing himself in memory back into the past, the son of Zebedee would reappear as a more important John than himself, so that the Baptist would need his title after all. And on such a hypothesis how explain the omission of all mention of either son of Zebedee, of James as well as John, except in the additional chapter? And why have we there merely *οἱ τοῦ Ζεβεδαίου*, the names being avoided, while it is implied that everybody knows them? Assuredly it is as absurd to suppose the writer to be a third John, as to suppose that Justin, Irenaeus, Leucius, and Polycrates could have been mistaken, Asiatics as they were, in believing that the Apostle John lived in Asia.

So far there are no difficulties in the 'Johaninne question'. All is perfectly plain sailing. But we have reached at last the one real difficulty¹—it is a great one—the difference of style between the Gospel and the Apocalypse.

But the difficulty lies not merely in harmonizing the internal evidence for difference of authorship with the external evidence for identity of authorship; it lies just as much in harmonizing the evidence from difference of style (in the widest sense) with the evidence from identity of certain characteristics of doctrine. These last are so little to be despised that they have led Harnack to acknowledge the identity of authorship. And in fact the enormous weight of external evidence obliges us to accept the evidence from these characteristics, and to explain as best we may the differences of style. And we must remember that there are differences of manner within the Apocalypse itself. The epistles to the seven Churches are not very like some of the descriptive or lyrical or denunciatory portions of the same book, nor are they in the least like the discourses in the Gospel.

¹ I do not, of course, count among critical difficulties the difficulty which is created solely by dogmatic presuppositions, and which is well formulated in Wrede's posthumous lectures on the Origin of the N. T. (Engl. transl., 1909, p. 87): 'The decision that it [the fourth Gospel] cannot originate with the apostle is placed beyond doubt by internal evidence, the nature of the Gospel itself. On this the whole of the scientifically impartial theological world is as good as united in opinion.' A person who imagines that the authorship of a work can be denied, entirely apart from all external evidence, on the ground of his own *a priori* notion of what the reputed author (otherwise unknown) ought to have written, may be a scientifically impartial theologian, for all I know, but he is not a critic at all. I am not dealing with theologians in these notes, but with critics.

But their authoritative tone is by no means unlike the three Epistles of St. John. Again, there is extraordinary dramatic power in the Gospel, and considerable sense of humour, together with very vivid delineation of character. The Apocalypse may be held to show an almost equal power (sometimes lyrical as well as dramatic) exercised on a different subject-matter, and purposely clothed in the language of the Old Testament prophets. But the antagonism to the world-power and the rejoicings over the fall of Babylon which so scandalize certain German critics of the Apocalypse are not merely borrowed from Isaiah and Ezekiel, but they are characteristic of the Son of Thunder and are strictly parallel to the hatred of the *κόσμος* and its Prince which has so large a place in the theology of the Gospel and Epistle. The dragon in the Apocalypse, the Antichrist in the Epistle, the Prince of this world in the Gospel are not dissimilar. The Apocalypse is in fact a commentary on such texts as: 'The whole world lieth in the evil one', 'Now is the judgement of this world, and the Prince of this world is judged', 'Fear not, I have overcome the world', 'My kingdom is not of this world' (1 John v. 19; John xii. 31; xvi. 33; xviii. 36). Such remarks might be multiplied.¹ But how account for the great differences of literary style, of vocabulary, &c.?

¹ An objection to the apostolic authorship of the Apocalypse is often drawn from the mention of Apostles by the writer: an Apostle, it is assumed, could not have spoken so. Now the 'holy Apostles' in Apoc. xviii. 20 who are invited to rejoice over the fall of Babylon are obviously St. Peter and St. Paul, who had been martyred by Nero in Rome, that is in Babylon. The prophets who are to rejoice with them are presumably the Old Testament prophets who had predicted the fall of Babylon. When St. Peter

(a) Harnack thinks the adoption of a Jewish Apocalypse by the Christian writer will explain the matter. I do not see that it accounts for the difference of vocabulary and of literary style throughout the work, and in every verse.

(b) Lightfoot and Westcott and Hort, with the enormous weight of their authority, uphold the Neronian date of the Apocalypse. It is true that thirty years might account for the differences of style. But I cannot myself get over the evidence for the date under Domitian.

called Rome Babylon, he thereby applied their prophecies to Rome. There is a real difficulty, however, at first sight in the statement of Apoc. xxi. 14 that the twelve foundations of the new Jerusalem are the twelve Apostles of the Lamb. But St. Paul had said that Christians are 'built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets' (Eph. ii. 20), yet he certainly counted himself as both an Apostle and a Prophet (for here the N. T. prophets seem to be meant). I may be told that this verse tells against the authenticity of Ephesians, and therefore I turn to the entirely complete answer which lies to hand. The whole objection to the unnaturalness of the expression in Apoc. xxi lies in the assumption that the entire subject-matter of the book is an invention of the writer, who is throwing his teaching into the Apocalyptic form which was the fashion of the day. If, on the contrary, we admit that he is writing down something that he saw—whether we call it a vision or a dream—the objection vanishes, for there is no improbability whatever in his having been shown, or in his having conceived that he was shown, that he himself was one of the foundations of the new Jerusalem. I myself do not hold that it was the fashion of the day simply to write Apocalypses, but rather to see Apocalypses. Much of the Apocalyptic literature of the times may be mere forgery, but surely some of it was vision or delusion. There are many grades of beauty, of reasonableness, of instructiveness, and of delusion in visions, and they have been common in various forms in every age. So far as my experience goes they are common enough to-day. St. Paul tells us of prophets and prophecy among the Christians. The Johannine Apocalypse is more naturally to be regarded as a revelation or a delusion than as a literary fraud.

(c) We may remember that the son of Zebedee was not an educated man. We may insist, if we will, that his father employed hired servants on his fishing boats—so do most owners of fishing boats, but they are not for that of higher rank or more learning than the men whose wages they pay—and that he was known to the High Priest—a friend of his servants. But St. Luke tells us that Peter and John were untaught and uneducated men, ἀγράμματοι καὶ ἰδιῶται (Acts iv. 13). St. John may or may not have been able to read and write. He certainly did not remain with his mind uncultivated. He could be read to, if he could not read; he could listen, discuss, consider, as well as preach. In his long life he saw and heard a great deal, and he thought a great deal. Moreover, he was by nature an extraordinary genius. But he had no literary training.

The ancients as often as not dictated when they wrote a letter or a book. The amanuensis took down their words in shorthand. He read the result again to them and made corrections, and finally a fair copy. If publication was to follow, this copy went to the publisher to be read aloud to a number of trained calligraphers. It was possible to dictate to the tachygrapher at a very considerable pace (e. g. St. Jerome translating some of the Minor Prophets). But there was plenty of time for second thoughts. Consequently men like Peter and John could easily compose a letter or a book if a disciple with some literary training assisted them. We learn that for preaching Mark was Peter's interpreter, so Peter was not good at Greek. The vocabulary of 1 Peter is strangely Pauline; there are not only coincidences with some Pauline Epistles, but the whole is

a sort of imitation of Pauline style by a man who knew Romans and Ephesians by heart, and perhaps had the latter Epistle open before him, since he was writing to the same Churches. But then we know that Silvanus, who carried the letter to Asia, was the close comrade of St. Paul, and one of the senders of the epistles to the Thessalonians. What wonder if he assisted St. Peter to a good Greek style, and clothed the Apostle's beautiful thoughts (most of them not in the least Pauline) in Pauline phraseology?

Now the vocabulary of the Apocalypse is seen on analysis to be almost as Pauline as that of 1 Peter. We may suppose St. John's assistant or amanuensis at Ephesus (that capital of the Pauline Churches) had St. Paul's Epistles by rote, and regarded them as the model for Christian writings. The Old Testament, especially Ezekiel, accounts for the style of large portions of the work, &c.

On the other hand there is nothing Pauline in the Gospel, so far as I can see, except the deliberate reference to St. Paul's teaching in i. 14, 16, 17, 18. The literary assistant was evidently not formed on St. Paul's writings, or rather he did not model his style on them. He seems to have been anxious to preserve the short and simple sentences of the aged Apostle in perfectly plain and straightforward Greek, without elaborate construction, almost without subordinate clauses.

It may be supposed that this implies a great deal of the assistant's work in the result, and little more than direction from the Apostle. That is the very opposite of my meaning. I should imagine that the writing entailed a great deal of labour for both—reading what

had been written, correcting, re-modelling, inserting new matter, emphasizing or toning down, until the Apostle is quite satisfied that his meaning is accurately conveyed.¹ In the Gospel one would imagine that every discourse had needed long polishing before it reached its present state, with wave after wave of thought developing the doctrine as recalled by the Apostle. Still more the composition of the whole Gospel must have entailed much thought and much adjustment. The writing of a dramatic chapter like the story of the blind man (ix) would go much quicker, and so would the whole of the Apocalypse.

I am not giving here *ex professo* a defence of the Johannine authorship of the Gospel nor of the Apocalypse; I am only sketching the way in which I have myself long found it simplest to account for the differences and the resemblances in the two documents, taking into consideration the external evidence for unity. It has seemed to me unavoidable that in treating of the existence or non-existence of that problematical personage, John the Presbyter, I should go thus far afield. But I am obliged to conclude by explaining that I do not regard these notes as doing more than remove certain difficulties in the way of the perception of the essential unanimity of the external evidence for the residence of one John in Asia Minor. It has become quite common to speak of many points as doubtful (especially as to the testimony of St. Irenaeus) which I believe to be susceptible of definite proof. I daresay I have been, as usual, inclined to be too positive here and there, but

¹ Wellhausen's elaborate dissections (above referred to) are all in favour of this hypothesis.

most of my arguments represent the conviction of many years. On the general question there is much more to be said, and it has been said by Westcott, Drummond, Lepin, Armitage Robinson, and others. I am only sorry that I have been necessitated in these pages to repeat so much that has frequently been said before. .

ADDITIONAL NOTE ON DE BOOR'S FRAGMENT OF PHILIP OF SIDE

A. On p. 34 I have said that Philip of Side 'as may easily be shown, had no independent acquaintance with Papias's book'. It has been suggested to me that if it is easy to show this, I had better do so. Hence this additional note.

I do not think the matter important, simply because I hold that Papias cannot possibly have said that James and John were killed by the Jews. The first reason given above, p. 78, is amply sufficient to my mind. Nevertheless the following analysis of De Boor's fragment, if out of place, may not be wholly unnecessary.

The passage was published from MS. Barocc. 142 (fol. 216^a) in 1888 by De Boor (*Texte und Untersuchungen*, v. 2, pp. 182-4). After examining the MS., I am inclined to think the excerpt is (as De Boor thought) from the *Christian history* of Philippus Sidetes. But this is uncertain, for several authors have been used by the excerptor, who has headed his collection (fol. 212) with the rubric:

Συναγωγή ιστοριῶν διαφόρων ἀπὸ τῆς κατὰ σάρκα γεννήσεως τοῦ κυρίου καὶ ἐξῆς. τὴν ἀρχὴν ἔχουσα ἀπὸ τοῦ πρώτου λόγου τῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς ιστορίας Εὐσεβίου τοῦ Παμφίλου. [In margin, also red: ἀπὸ φωνῆς Νικηφόρου Καλλίστου τοῦ ξανθοπλ.]

The passage about Papias begins thus:

Παπίας Ἱεραπόλεως ἐπίσκοπος ἀκουστῆς τοῦ θεολόγου Ἰωάννου γενόμενος, Πολυκάρπου δὲ ἐταῖρος, πέντε λόγους

κυριακῶν λογίων ἔγραψεν. ἐν οἷς ἀπαρίθμῃσιν ἀποστόλων ποιούμενος μετὰ Πέτρον καὶ Ἰωάννην, Φίλιππον καὶ Θωμᾶν καὶ Ματθαῖον εἰς μαθητὰς τοῦ Κυρίου ἀνέγραψεν Ἀριστίωνα καὶ Ἰωάννην ἕτερον, ὃν καὶ πρεσβύτερον ἐκάλεσεν.

So far all is from Eusebius, *H. E.* iii. 36. 2 and 39. 1-4. Then follows a comment, suggested by Euseb. iii. 25. 3 and vii. 25:

ὥς τινες οἶεσθαι, ὅτι [τούτου] τοῦ Ἰωάννου εἰσὶν αἱ δύο ἐπιστολαὶ αἱ μικραὶ καὶ καθολικαί, αἱ ἐξ ὀνόματος Ἰωάννου φερόμεναι, διὰ τοὺς ἀρχαίους τὴν πρώτην μόνην ἐγκρίνειν· τινὲς δὲ καὶ τὴν Ἀποκάλυψιν τούτου πλανηθέντες ἐνόμισαν.

Then another statement from Euseb. *H. E.* iii. 39. 11-13:

καὶ Παπίας δὲ περὶ τὴν χιλιονταετηρίδα σφάλλεται, ἐξ οὗ καὶ ὁ Εἰρηναῖος.

There seems to be no doubt at all about the dependence of the foregoing passages on Eusebius, from whom Philip no doubt drew almost all the earlier part of his history. But the next passage is not from Eusebius, and it actually names the book of Papias from which it quotes:

Παπίας ἐν τῷ δευτέρῳ λόγῳ λέγει, ὅτι Ἰωάννης ὁ θεολόγος καὶ Ἰάκωβος ὁ ἀδελφὸς αὐτοῦ ὑπὸ Ἰουδαίων ἀνηρέθησαν.

It was shown on p. 78 that Papias cannot have said this. Philip is borrowing from a common source with George Hamartolus, who has preserved the context. Both were clearly borrowing at second hand, from an incorrect or corrupt authority.

The remainder is also independent of Eusebius. There is no reason to doubt that it is also quoted at second hand from the same source:

Παπίας ὁ εἰρημένος ἱστορήσεν ὡς παραλαβὼν ἀπὸ τῶν θυγατέρων Φιλίππου, ὅτι Βαρσαβᾶς ὁ καὶ Ἰοῦστος δοκιμαζόμενος ὑπὸ τῶν ἀπίστων ἰὼν ἐχίδνης πιδὼν ἐν ὀνόματι τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἀπαθῆς διεφυλάχθη.

The kind of poison is not mentioned by Eusebius. On the other hand Eusebius speaks of *one* wonderful event related to Papias by the daughters of Philip, and that was the raising of a dead person to life, though he so closely connects the story of Barsabas with the other, that it might easily be supposed that he referred it also to the daughters of Philip, in spite of the preceding singular *διήγησιν θαυμασίαν*. Philip may have misunderstood Eusebius, and words such as *ὡς παραλαβὼν ἀπὸ τῶν θυγατέρων Φιλίππου* were not necessarily in the source he used. He continues :

ἱστορεῖ δὲ καὶ ἄλλα θαύματα καὶ μάλιστα τὸ κατὰ τὴν μητέρα Μαναΐμου τὴν ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστᾶσαν.

This is the same remarkable story (see p. 65, note) which Eusebius tells us was learned by Papias from the daughters of Philip ; Philip makes to Eusebius's statement the addition that the subject of it was the mother of Manaïmus. Lastly we have :

περὶ τῶν ὑπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστάντων, ὅτι ἕως Ἀδριανοῦ ἔξων.

This is naturally to be compared with Eusebius, *H. E.* iv. 3. 1-2 :

Τούτῳ [sc. Ἀδριανῶ] Κοδρᾶτος λόγον προσφωνήσας ἀναδίδωσιν, Ἀπολογίαν συντάξας ὑπὲρ τῆς καθ' ἡμᾶς θεοσεβείας . . . ὁ δ' αὐτὸς τὴν καθ' ἑαυτὸν ἀρχαιότητα παραφαίνει, δι' ὧν ἱστορεῖ ταῦτα ἰδίαις φωναῖς. 'Τοῦ δὲ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν τὰ ἔργα αἰεὶ παρῆν, ἀληθῆ γὰρ ἦν, οἱ θεραπευθέντες, οἱ ἀναστάντες ἐκ νεκρῶν, οἱ οὐκ ὥφθησαν μόνον θεραπευόμενοι καὶ ἀνιστάμενοι, ἀλλὰ καὶ αἰεὶ παρόντες' οὐδὲ ἐπιδημοῦντος μόνον τοῦ Σωτῆρος, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀπαλλαγέντος ἦσαν ἐπὶ χρόνον ἰκανόν, ὥστε καὶ εἰς τοὺς ἡμετέρους χρόνους τινὲς αὐτῶν ἀφίκοντο.'

There can surely be no doubt about the dependence of the short sentence of Philip of Side on this passage of Eusebius. The latter says that Quadratus, in an

Apology addressed to Hadrian, stated that some of those healed or raised from the dead by Christ lived until his own time. This was a credible statement. Quadratus, writing between 117 and 138 might have called 30 or 40 years earlier 'our own time', i. e. 77-87 or 90-110. Some of those raised from the dead or healed (and these were more numerous) would naturally have lived till 80-90, and may well have lived longer. But Quadratus does not say that they lived till the time of Hadrian!

Philip, who had perhaps quoted Eusebius incorrectly already, has evidently made another blunder, and has put down to Papias what belonged to Quadratus. It is indeed conceivable that Papias (though he preferred oral tradition to the written word) might have quoted so interesting a passage of Quadratus. But it is quite inconceivable that he should have so misrepresented a contemporary writer. The authority quoted by Philip was no doubt capable of the blunder; but it is obvious that Philip himself is the culprit, for we have seen him supplement his authority with citations from Eusebius throughout the fragment; and here once more the authority of Eusebius is ready to hand. It is quite in character with the substitution of Papias for Quadratus, that Philip should speak of those raised from the dead without adding the more numerous class of persons who had been cured of sickness (it was indeed to these that the words of Quadratus were presumably meant to apply),—that he should jump to the conclusion that the 'times' of Quadratus meant the times in which Quadratus wrote and not the times which he could remember,—that he should speak generally as though all (!) and not

some (as Quadratus had said) survived until that improbable date.

Philip had some fine qualities, no doubt, else he would not have been several times so nearly made bishop of the imperial city. But Socrates¹ and Photius² assure us he was a wild historian, who filled nearly a thousand tomes (his history was of 36 books, each containing numerous tomes) with geometry and astronomy and geography under the name of history, and was unable to preserve any chronological sequence. If he is really answerable for these remarks on Papias, it is quite evident that he has drawn upon two sources. One of these is Eusebius, in various passages; the other was not the original work of Papias, otherwise Philip would not have made up most of his information by industriously yet carelessly combining passages of Eusebius. His second authority can only have been excerpts from Papias found by him in some other book unknown to us.

Thus I imagine I have proved what I set out to prove, viz. that Philip could easily be shown to have had no first-hand acquaintance with Papias's book.

This is on the assumption that the whole passage is excerpted or epitomized from Philip. But it is conceivable (though unlikely, I think, when we compare the rest of the matter in the same page of the MS.) that it was the excerptor who combined passages from Eusebius with other information about Papias which he found in Philip Sidetes. But in this case again we are dealing with an excerptor who had no first-hand acquaintance with the work of Papias.

B. The statement about the death of James and John

¹ vii. 27.

² *Bibl. cod.* 35.

is not independent of the interpolation into one MS. (the best) of George Hamartolus :

Παπίας γὰρ ὁ Ἱεραπόλεως ἐπίσκοπος, αὐτόπτης τούτου γενόμενος (i. e. Ἰωάννου), ἐν τῷ δευτέρῳ λόγῳ τῶν κυριακῶν λογίων φάσκει, ὅτι ὑπὸ Ἰουδαίων ἀνηρέθη πληρώσας δηλαδὴ μετὰ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ τὴν τοῦ Χριστοῦ περὶ αὐτῶν πρόρρησιν καὶ τὴν ἑαυτῶν ὁμολογίαν περὶ τούτου καὶ συγκατάθεσιν· εἰπὼν γὰρ ὁ Κύριος πρὸς αὐτούς· Δύνασθε πιεῖν τὸ ποτήριον ὃ ἐγὼ πίνω; καὶ κατανευσάντων προθύμως καὶ συνθεμένων· τὸ ποτήριόν μου, φησὶν, πίεσθε, καὶ τὸ βάπτισμα ὃ ἐγὼ βαπτίζομαι βαπτισθήσεσθε. καὶ εἰκότως· ἀδύνατον γὰρ Θεὸν ψεύσασθαι.¹

The ἐν τῷ δευτέρῳ λόγῳ is the same in both, although βιβλίῳ or τόμῳ would be rather expected; so the comment is presumably from the same authority (very likely Philip,—but this is a detail). We infer that Papias was commenting on the prediction of Christ that both the brothers should drink of His chalice. Similarly Polycrates calls John a martyr. The same kind of comment is found in Origen and in a fragment of Pseudo-Polycarp. As these are of early date, I give them in a note.² They probably represent very much

¹ On the authenticity or interpolation of this passage, see Zahn, *Forschungen*, vi. 148.

² Εἴ γε ἔχειν λόγον τὸ τοιοῦτον δόξαι τισί, πεπώκασι δὲ ποτήριον καὶ τὸ βάπτισμα ἐβαπτίσθησαν οἱ τοῦ Ζεβεδαίου υἱοί, ἐπεὶ περ Ἡρώδης μὲν ἀπέκτεινεν Ἰάκωβον τὸν Ἰωάννου μαχαίρα, ὃ δὲ Ῥωμαίων βασιλεὺς, ὡς ἡ παράδοσις διδάσκει, κατεδίκασε τὸν Ἰωάννην μαρτυροῦντα διὰ τὸν τῆς ἀληθείας λόγον εἰς Πάτμον τὴν νήσον. Διδάσκει δὲ τὰ περὶ τοῦ μαρτυρίου ἑαυτοῦ Ἰωάννης, μὴ λέγων τίς αὐτὸν κατεδίκασε, φάσκων ἐν τῇ Ἀποκαλύψει ταῦτα· ‘Ἐγὼ Ἰωάννης ὁ ἀδελφὸς ὑμῶν, καὶ συγκοινωνὸς ἐν τῇ θλίψει καὶ βασιλείᾳ καὶ ὑπομονῇ ἐν Ἰησοῦ, ἐγενόμην ἐν τῇ νήσῳ τῇ καλουμένῃ Πάτμῳ διὰ τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ’ καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς· καὶ ἔοικε τὴν Ἀποκάλυψιν ἐν τῇ νήσῳ τεθεωρηκέναι. Origen in Matt. xx. 22, Tom. xvi. 6, Lommatsch, iv, p. 18. The last words seem to be quoted by Victorinus (cited above, p. 56, note): ‘Ibi ergo uidetur Iohannes apocalipsim scripsisse’. The Pseudo-Polycarp fragment runs thus: ‘Item ad haec verba Christi: “Calicem meum bibetis,” etc. Matt. xx. 23.

Per huiusmodi potum significat passionem, et Iacobum quidem

what Papias really said, even though they may be quite independent of him. But Origen's expression, ἡ παράδοσις διδάσκει, might possibly refer to a written authority.

How whatever Papias said got corrupted it is superfluous to inquire. Zahn and Lightfoot have both made ingenious conjectures on the subject. Anyhow we have his words at third or fourth hand, and the statement that John was killed by the Jews is no more to be believed than so many other absurd quotations from authors early and late. Let me instance the strange muddle in the well-known short Latin Prologue to St. John, which represents St. John as rejecting Marcion, and Papias as his careful amanuensis. Another good example which occurs to me is the 8th Pseudo-Justin fragment (Otto, III. ii, p. 374, from Cowper's *Syriac Miscellanies*, 1861), where Justin is called 'one of the authors who were in the days of Augustus and Tiberius and Gaius'; and a passage from the second part of his Dialogue is misquoted and embroidered, and said to be from his 'third discourse'. But such parallels are common enough.

novissimum martyrio consummandum, fratrem vero eius Ioannem transiturum absque martyrio, quamvis et afflictiones plurimas et exsilia toleravit, sed praeeparatam martyrio mentem Christus martyrem iudicavit. Nam Apostolus Paulus "Quotidie" inquit "mori"; dum impossibile sit quotidie mori hominem ea morte qua semel vita haec finitur. Sed quoniam pro evangelio ad mortem iugiter erat praeparatus, se mori quotidie sub ea significatione testatus est. Legitur et in dolio ferventis olei pro nomine Christi beatus Ioannes fuisse demersus.'

I will boldly say that I am inclined to believe that all the five Pseudo-Polycarp fragments enshrine bits of Papias. The heading to them as given by Feuardent was: *Victor Episcopus Capuae ex responsione capitulorum sancti Polycarpi Smyrnensis episcopi, discipuli Ioannis evangelistae*. Either Victor himself (though he was a careful man) or a scribe wrote Polycarp for Papias.

INDEX

- Abbott, Dr. E. A., on Prologue of Papias, 9; suggests emendation of it, 20, 23; on martyrdom of John by the Jews, 79.
- Acts of John, their witness to one John at Ephesus, 53, 79.
- Agabus, 70.
- Alogi, their witness to St. John at Ephesus, 53-5, 85; a Roman not Asiatic party, 53.
- Amanuensis or *notarius*, using shorthand, 91.
- Ammia, 70.
- Andrew of Caesarea, 58.
- Andrew, St., in Muratorian fragment, 45.
- Anti-Montanist writer, cited by Eusebius, on daughters of Philip the deacon, 70.
- Apocalypse, date of, 47, 50-1, 57; Johannine matter, 88-9, Pauline vocabulary, 92; style compared with fourth Gospel, 89; not founded on a Jewish writing, 90; by Cerinthus, 54, 57.
- Apocalypses, often visions or delusions rather than literary frauds, 90.
- Apollonius, 55.
- Apostles, use of the word by Papias, 59, by St. Paul, 59, in N. T., 60 foll.; order of Apostles in Papias's Prologue, 66-7; mention of Apostles in Apoc. not inconsistent with Apostolic authorship, 89-90.
- Aristion was a disciple of the Lord, 20-27; personally known to Papias, 28-32; bishop of Smyrna acc. to Apost. Const., 36.
- Augustine, St., on tomb of St. John, 33, 79.
- Bacon, Prof., suggests emendation of the Prologue of Papias, 20, 23.
- Bardenhewer on the Presbyters of Papias, 9.
- Bar Salibi witnesses that Gaius rejected the fourth Gospel, 53.
- Bernard, Dean, on feast of SS. James and John, 78.
- Blass on use of *γούν*, 30.
- Bodleian MS. Barocc. 142, 95.
- Book, how composed in ancient times, 91.
- Bovon on date of Apoc., 51.
- Carthaginian Kalendar on feast of James and John, 78.
- Chase on date of Apocalypse, 50-1.
- Clement of Alexandria's use of *γούν*, 29; probably read Papias, 49; used spurious Acts of Apostles, 55; his witness to one John at Ephesus, 55; on daughters of Philip, 69; on St. John and the Robber, 74; on return of St. John to Ephesus, 78.
- Commodian may have used Papias, 49.
- Corssen on the grammatical con-

struction of the Prologue of Papias, 26; doubts whether Papias knew John, 28.

De Boor's fragment of Papias, on Manaïmos, 65; analysis of, 95-9.

Dionysius of Corinth, 70.

Dionysius of Alexandria on the tomb of John, 33, 55-6; on two Johns, 77.

Diotrephes, 38.

Disciple used for Apostle by Papias, 59, 62, by Evangelists, 60; the word is not in Pauline or Catholic Epistles or Apocalypse, 60; used of John and Aristion by Papias, 62; of John by himself in his Gospel, 62-3.

Dodgson, Rev. C. L., 85.

Domitian, decrees reversed by Senate, 51; date of Apocalypse under, 47, 50-1, 57; return of John to Ephesus after death of, 51, 78.

Drummond, Dr., quoted, 48.

Duchesne on tomb of John, 33.

ἡμεῖς used by St. Irenaeus of himself, 47.

Epiphanius, St., on Alogi, 53, 57.

Epistles of St. John, their witness to one John of Ephesus, 72, 75-6, 85.

ἕτερος, meaning of, 67-8.

Eusebius on the Presbyters of Papias, 17-19; makes John and Aristion disciples of the Lord, 21-3; says Papias was hearer of John, 29-30; his use of γοῦν, 28-30; in Theophania on the tomb of John, 33; argument for two Johns, 34 foll.; in his Chronicle does not allow

for two Johns, 34; prejudiced against Apocalypse, 41; confuses two Philips, 64-5; witnesses to tradition that there was only one John at Ephesus, 57-8; used in De Boor's fragment, 96-9; and misunderstood by its author, 97-8.

Gaius attributes fourth Gospel to Cerinthus, 53; and Apocalypse, 54, 57; identical with the Alogi, 53-4; blunders about daughters of Philip, 69; on tombs of SS. Peter and Paul, 70.

γερεά, meaning of, 47.

George Hamartolus, interpolated quotation from Papias, 100.

George Syncellus, quotes Chronicle of Eusebius, 34.

Gospel, fourth, uses the word 'disciple' for 'Apostle', 59-63; author claims to be an Apostle, 73; author not a boy at time of crucifixion, 73; internal evidence shows his name was John, 86; no mention of James, 87; way in which it may have been composed, 92; defenders of, 94.

γοῦν, meaning of, 28-30.

Gutjahr on Presbyters of Papias, 9; on Irenaeus's witness to John the Apostle, 42.

Hamartolus, *see* George.

Harnack, Dr. A., on verses against Marcus, 14; on attribution to Pothinus of sermon in Irenaeus, 14; holds Philip of Hierapolis to be the deacon, 64; on authorship of fourth Gospel by both Johns, 73-7;

- his mystical interpretation of 1 John i. 1, 76.
- Haussleiter suggests emendation of the Prologue of Papias, 20; on Victorinus, 56.
- Hegesippus on banishment of St. John, 57.
- Heracleon on St. John, 55.
- High Priest, author of fourth Gospel known to, 91.
- Hippolytus on Alogi and Gaius, 53, 56; witness to one John at Ephesus, 56-7; follows Tertullian's chronology, 57.
- Hort, Dr. F. J. A., on date of Apocalypse, 50-51; on Victorinus, 56.
- idia*, meaning of, 81.
- Ignatius of Antioch, 70.
- Irenaeus, St., his use of the word Presbyter, 13-16; calls John 'disciple of the Lord', 23-4; calls Papias a 'hearer of John', 31-2; uses 'Presbyters' as a periphrasis for Papias, 32; uses two Epistles of John, 37; identifies John the Presbyter with the Apostle, 41-8; makes him author of Gospel, Epistles, and Apocalypse, 42; date of birth of Irenaeus, 46-8; witness to the traditions of Asia Minor, 46-8; on date of Apocalypse, 47, 51-2; on death of John under Trajan, 51, 78.
- Jackson, H. L., 43.
- Jacobs, W. W., 39.
- James, the name used absolutely only after death of son of Zebedee, 61; feast of James and John, 78.
- Jerome, St., Chronicle, 34; letter to Anatolius prefixed to expurgated edition of Victorinus, 56; story of St. John in old age, 74; swift dictation, 91.
- John the Presbyter personally known to Papias, 28-32; the only John at Ephesus, 78; witness to his own identity with the Apostle, 84-93.
- John, Saint, the Apostle, at Ephesus according to Justin, 49-50, to Polycarp, 44-6, to Leucius, 53, to Polycrates, 51-2, to Irenaeus, 41-3, to Gaius and the Alogi, 53-5, and others, 55-8; called a 'disciple' by Papias, 62, and by himself, 62-3; returns from Ephesus under Nerva, 57, 78; an uneducated man, 91; martyred by the Jews (?), 78, 82, 95-8.
- John, Saint, the Baptist, called simply 'John' in fourth Gospel, 86.
- John-Mark confused with the Apostle, according to Wellhausen, 81.
- Josephus, use of *γῶν*, 29.
- Jude, called Thaddaeus until death of Iscariot, 61.
- Jülicher on 'the Presbyter' in 2 and 3 John, 38; paradox, 87.
- Justin, St., probably read Papias, 49; makes the Apostle John author of the Apocalypse, 50; spurious fragment of, 101.
- Klopas not the husband of the Mother of Christ, in Wellhausen's opinion, 80.
- Lactantius may have read Papias, 49.
- Last Supper, only the Twelve were present, 73.

- Lawlor, Dr., on Hegesippus, 57.
- Lepin, M. Marius, on the Presbyters of Papias, 9; defence of St. John, 94.
- Leucius, Acts of John by, 53, 79.
- Lewis, Dr. F. G., on St. Irenaeus's witness to one John of Ephesus, 42-3.
- Lightfoot, Bishop J. B., on Presbyters of Papias, 9; on Philip the Apostle at Hierapolis, 64; on three daughters of the latter, 67-9; distinguishes between John the Presbyter of Papias and John the Presbyter of 2 and 3 John, 72; on witness of fourth Gospel to the name John of its author, 86; on Neronian date of Apocalypse, 90; on martyrdom of St. John by Jews, 101.
- Lyons, letter of the Church of, 13, 79.
- Manaïmos, 97; not the same as Manaën, 65.
- Marcus, poem against, 13-14.
- Mark, St., confused with St. John, according to Wellhausen, 81.
- Mary Magdalen, according to Wellhausen interpolated in John xix. 25, 80.
- Mary of Cleophas, according to Wellhausen, not the correct name for the Mother of Christ, 80.
- Mayor, Prof. J. B., on brethren of the Lord, 80.
- Maximus, St., Confessor, used the work of Papias, 58.
- Melito, Commentary on Apocalypse, 55.
- Michiels on Presbyters of Papias, 9.
- Moffat, on recent views of the date of the Apocalypse, 50.
- Mommsen, Dr. Theodor, on the Johannine controversy, 7; suggests emendation of Prologue of Papias, 21-3.
- Montanists appeal to daughters of Philip the deacon, 69-70.
- Muratorian fragment on Epistles of St. John, 37; on St. Andrew, 45; on St. John, 59.
- Nicephorus Callisti, 21.
- Occam, William of, quoted, 39.
- Origen on return of St. John to Ephesus, 78, 100; witness to one John of Ephesus, 55; on daughters of Philip, 70; on martyrdom of St. John, 79, 100.
- Papias, St., his Prologue quoted, 8; discussed and examined, 9-40; perhaps called a Presbyter by Irenaeus, 15; quoted as 'the Presbyters' by Irenaeus, 16, 32; grammatical construction of passage in Prologue, 24; knew John and Aristion personally, 28-32; does not necessarily imply two Johns, 40; much used in second and third centuries, 49; read by Andrew of Caesarea, Maximus, Apollinarius, Anastasius Sinaita, 58; uses 'disciple' for 'Apostle', 59-63; gives Philip a prominent place in list of Apostles, 66; cannot have said St. John was killed by the Jews, 78, 95; De Boor's fragment and the interpolation in George Hamartolus dis-

- cussed, 95 foll. ; his book not known to Philip of Side, 95-9.
- Paul, St., his use of the word Apostle, 59 ; does not use 'disciple', 60 ; vocabulary, 91-2.
- Peter, St., appealed to as a prophet by Montanists, 70 ; an uneducated man, 91 ; his literary style probably due to his notarius, 92.
- Philip, St., Apostle, at Hierapolis, 51, 64-71 ; only one daughter buried at Hierapolis, 67-9.
- Philip, St., the deacon, no traditions from him in Papias, 66-7 ; his daughters appealed to by Montanists, 65, 69-70.
- Philip of Side, quotes Eusebius on tomb of John, 34 ; the quotations from Papias attributed to him analyzed, 95 foll.
- Polycarp, Pseudo, on death of St. John, 100-1.
- Polycarp, St., counted as a Presbyter by Irenaeus, 14-15 ; still young at time of St. John's death, 36 ; well remembered by St. Irenaeus, 44 ; could remember St. John, 44 ; sent to Asia as bishop by Apostles, 45.
- Polycrates, Gaius replies to his letter, 54, 71 ; on John the Apostle at Ephesus, 51 ; on Philip the Apostle at Hierapolis, 64, 67-8 ; only mentions two daughters of Philip, 67-8 ; calls St. John a martyr, 79, 100.
- Pothinus, St., perhaps author of sermon quoted by Irenaeus, 14 ; probably born in Asia, 48.
- Proclus, Montanist, appealed to daughters of Philip, 69-70.
- Quadratus, appealed to by Montanists, 70 ; confused with Papias by Philip of Side, 97-9.
- Renan suggests emendation of Papias's Prologue, 20.
- Robinson, Dean J. Armitage, on date of Apocalypse, 50 ; on feast of SS. James and John, 78.
- Robinson, Rev. T. H., on the *Logi*, 53.
- Rufinus, translation of Eusebius, 12, 21.
- Salmon, Dr. G., quoted on the internal evidence of the fourth Gospel to the name of John for its author, 86.
- Sanday, Dr. W., on Pothinus, 14 ; on date of Apocalypse, 50-1 ; criticism of Schwartz, 65 ; of Harnack, 75.
- Schwartz on Manaïmos and Manaën, 65.
- Scott, Rev. C. A., 43.
- Side, *see* Philip of Side.
- Smyrna, Aristion at, 31, 35 ; bishop of, 36.
- Stanton, Canon V. H., 28.
- Style of fourth Gospel compared with that of Apocalypse, 88-90.
- Supper, the last, only the Twelve present, 73.
- Swete, Dr. H. B., on Irenaeus, 43 ; on date of Apocalypse, 50.
- Syncellus, *see* George.
- Synoptists' use of words 'Apostle' and 'disciple', 60.
- Syriac Martyrology on feast of SS. James and John, 78.
- Tachygraphers, 91.

Tertullian on St. John at Ephesus, 55; his imperial chronology omitted Claudius, 57.

Thomas, St., coupled with St. Philip, 66; mentioned particularly in fourth Gospel, 67.

Thaddaeus, name for St. Jude until death of Iscariot, 61.

Thucydides' use of *γοῦν*, 29.

Tichonius perhaps used Papias, 49.

Tomb of John at Ephesus, 33.

Turner, C. H., 28.

Vatican MS. lat. 3288 A of Victorinus, 56.

Victorinus, St., used Papias, 49; on St. John at Ephesus, 56; may have followed Hippolytus, 56-7; on return of John to Ephesus, 78.

Wellhausen on fourth Gospel, 80-3.

Westcott, Bishop B. F., distinguishes between John the Presbyter of Papias and John the Presbyter of 2 and 3 John, 72; on Neronian date of Apocalypse, 90; defence of fourth Gospel, 94.

Wrede on scientifically impartial theology, 88.

Zahn, Dr. Theodor, commentary on Prologue of Papias, 7; on Presbyters of Papias, 9; on Pothinus, 14; on the tomb of St. John in later writers, 33; on date of Polycarp's birth, 45-6; on that of Irenaeus, 48; on Acts of John, 53; conjectural emendation of Irenaeus, 54; holds that Philip the deacon died at Hierapolis, 64; on brethren of the Lord, 80; on interpolation in George Hamartolus, 101.

Theology Library

SCH

A. C.

California

BS2615 .C38

Chapman, John, Father, 1865-1933.
John the Presbyter, and the Fourth gosp

BS Chapman, John, Father, 1865-1933.
2615 John the Presbyter, and the Fourth gospel.
C38 Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1911.
108p. 23cm.

1. John, Saint. 2. Bible. N.T. John--
Criticism, Textual. 3. John, the Presbyter.
I. Title.

CCSC/mmb

339501

